Two Discourses

CONCERNING the

ADORATION

OF OUR

B. SAVIOUR

IN THE

EUCHARIST.

WOODHEAD.

The FIRST:

ANIMADVERSIONS upon the *Alterations* of the *RUBRICK* in the *Communion-Service*, in the *Common-Prayer-Book* of the CHURCH of *ENGLAND*.

The SECOND:

The *Catholicks* DEFENCE for their *Adoration* of our *LORD*, as believed Really and Substantially present in the Holy *Sacrament* of the EUCHARIST.

Henry Aldrich

AT OXFORD

265.3
card
5733

ANIMADVERSIONS
UPON THE
ALTERATIONS of the RUBRICK in the *COMMUNION-SERVICE*, &c.

CONTENTS.

A *Brief Narration of the Alterations made in the Engliſh* Reformed Service *of the Euchariſt by* K. Edw. VI. *and* Qu. Elizabeth. §. 1, 2, 3.

Three Obſervables *concerning* K. Edward's *Declaration.* §. 4, 5, 6.

1. *Contrary to the* firſt Obſervable *the Preſence of our Lord's Natural Body and Blood in the* Euchariſt *maintained by* Calvin, Beza, *and* Engliſh Divines. §. 8, 9, 10, *&c.* to §. 18.

2. *Contrary to the* ſecond Obſervable, *the Reaſon given of our Lord's not being preſent; namely, becauſe a Body cannot be in two places at once, diſcuſſed. Where;*
   1. *Proteſtants are ſhewn confeſſing the Preſence of our Lord an ineffable Myſtery.*
   2. *That any one ſeeming contradiction can no more be effected by Divine Power, than another, or than many other the like may; and therefore this, of the ſame Bodies being at the ſame time in ſeveral places, cannot by theſe Writers be denied a poſſibility of being by the Divine power ſo verified.* §. 21.
   3. *That theſe Writers muſt hold this ſeeming contradiction true, or ſome other equivalent thereto, ſo long as holding a real ſubſtantial Preſence of the very Body of Chriſt to the worthy Communicant here on Earth, contradiſtinct to any ſuch other Real Preſence as implies only a preſence thereof in its virtue, efficacy, benefits, ſpirit.* §. 23.

The difference of Schoolmen concerning the Mode *of* Preſence *in the Euchariſt.* §. 24.

4. *This Propoſition, of a Bodies not being in ſeveral places at once, by the more judicious Proteſtants formerly not allowed to regulate their Faith, but only Divine Revelation.* §. 28.

3. *Contrary to the* third Obſervable, *That* no Adoration is intended, or due to any Corpor al Preſenee, *ſhewn.*

1. *That, all granting Kneeling and Adoration due to God the Father and the Son; not likely, that the Clergy will deny, That were there a Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, then ſuch Kneeling and Adoration to be due.* §. 39.

2. *Corporal Preſence denied (that is with the ordinary properties of a Body) yet if any other Preſence (whatever name be given it) as Real as one Corporal, be aſſigned from Divine Revelation, Adoration, thus, no leſs due.* §. 40.

3. *That the Church of* England *hath heretofore believed, and maintained ſuch Preſence, as they allowed, adorable.* §. 41.

Some Replies *that may be returned to this Diſcourſe, conſidered.*

1. *That not the Eſſence of the Body of our Lord is denied in the Euchariſt, but its corporal manner of Eſſence.* §. 48. *This granted by all.*

2. *That,* naturally, *Chriſt's Body cannot be at once in many places, tho'* ſupernaturally *it may; and therefore is here denied to be in the Euchariſt.*

1. *The truth of ſuch Exception is denied; ſince, if God can make the Eſſence, or Subſtance of a Body to be in more places or* ubi's *than one at once; he can make all the properties or qualities thereof to be ſo too.* §. 51.

2. *Admitting this Exception for true, as alſo the firſt, yet hence no foundation of denying Adoration due to Chriſt's natural Body as being in the Euchariſt: which being granted by theſe Replies to be there, tho' not after a natural manner, can be no leſs, for this an object of Adoration.* §. 52.

3. *That, Adoration to Chriſt's Body as really preſent in the Euchariſt is not denied, but only to any corporal Preſence there.*

1. *If ſo; the* Adoration *ought to have been expreſſed how due, as well as a* Preſence *denied.* §. 54.

Oppoſite Proteſtant Teſtimonies produced from the ſame Authors afford us no relief: ſince to free them from contradicting, either theſe here cited for Real Preſence *muſt ſtand; or, thoſe alledged for* Zuinglianiſm *in oppoſition to the general Tradition and Doctrine of the* Fathers. §. 55.

Concerning

Concerning the RUBRICK of the *Engliſh* *LITURGY*.

CHAP. I.

A brief Narration *of the Alterations made in the* Engliſh *Reformed* Service *of the Euchariſt.*

AFter that *King Edward*'s former *Liturgy* had been cenſured by many, eſpecially foreign Divines, as not ſufficiently purg'd, and removed to a right diſtance from the former errors, and ſuperſtitions of *Popery*, in the Fifth year of that King's Reign it ſuffered a Review and a new Reformation; and then, amongſt other things, this following *Declaration* in the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, for the explaining of the Intention of the Church of *England*, enjoyning kneeling at the receiving of the Communion, was *de novo* inſerted into it. §. 1.

Whereas it is ordained in this Office of the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants ſhould receive the ſame kneeling, (which Order is well meant for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of ſuch profanation and diſorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwiſe enſue,) yet, leſt the ſame kneeling ſhould by any perſons, either out of Ignorance and Infirmity, or out of Malice and Obſtinacy, be miſconſtrued and depraved; it is here declared, that no Adoration is intended or ought to be done unto any Real *and Eſſential* Preſence *of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural Subſtances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were Idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Chriſtians.) And the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Chriſt are in Heaven, and not here; it being againſt the truth of Chriſt's natural Body, to be at one time in more places than one.*

There were alſo certain *Articles* of Religion compoſed under King *Edward*, about the ſame time as the ſecond Common Prayer Book was. In one of which (the *Article* concerning the *Lord's Supper*) is found this explicatory Paragraph. ---*For as much as the*

the truth of Man's Nature requireth, that the Body of one and the ſelf ſame Man cannot be at one time in divers places, but muſt needs be in one certain place; therefore the Body of Chriſt cannot be preſent at one time in many and divers places: and becauſe, as Holy Scripture doth teach, Chriſt was taken up into Heaven, and there ſhall continue unto the end of the World; a faithful Man ought not either to believe, or to confeſs, the Real *and Bodily* Preſence, *as they term it, of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

* Hiſt. of Q. Eliz. p. 124.

But in the beginning of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign (who is obſerved by Dr. *Heylin* *, and others, to have been a zealous Propugner of the *Real Preſence*) upon a ſecond Review by her Divines of the ſame *Common-Prayer Book* it was thought meet, that this *Declaration* ſhould be thrown out again, and ſo the Common-Prayer Books ever ſince have been cleared of it till the alterations therein made after the King's return in *A. D.* 1661. at which time it was reinſerted.

The ſame Q. *Elizabeth*'s Divines, in their Review of theſe *Articles* alſo, as they caſt the Declaration out of the Liturgy, ſo did they expunge this paſſage likewiſe, being of the ſame temper as the *Declaration*, out of the *Article*; which hath been omitted ever ſince.

§. 2. Again; whereas King *Edward*'s *former* Common-Prayer Book uſeth theſe words, (as they have deſcended from Antiquity) in delivering the Euchariſt, [*The Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt preſerve thy Body and Soul to everlaſting life,*] the Compoſers of the *ſecond* in the fifth year of that King's Reign, ſuitable to their *Declaration*, which denies any Real or Eſſential Preſence of this Body in the Euchariſt, thought fit to remove this Form, and put inſtead thereof only theſe words, [*Take and eat this* (left without any ſubſtantive) *in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart with Faith and Thankſgiving,*] leaving out theſe words alſo of the former *Conſecration-Prayer*, [*And with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchſafe to bleſs and ſanctifie theſe thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy moſt dearly beloved Son Jeſus Chriſt.*]

They omit alſo the *Prieſt*'s touching or handling the *Patin* or *Chalice* in the Prayer of *Conſecration*, required in the former Book, done according to *Bucer*'s directions in his *Cenſura* p. 468. whereby ſeems to be avoided the acknowledging of any Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood with the Symbols: of which alſo *Bucer* * Cenſura p. 476. *ſaith* *, *Antichriſtianum eſt affirmare quidquam his elementis adeſſe Chriſti, extra uſum præbitionis & receptionis.* For the ſame reaſon

it

it ſeems to be, that the *Glory be to God on high*, &c. and the *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini*, after the *Surſum corda*, the one is tranſferred till after the Communion; and the other omitted, differently from King *Edward*'s firſt Form: likewiſe whereas it is ſaid in the former *Liturgy* in the Prayer of *Humble acceſs*, ---- *Grant us ſo to eat the Fleſh of thy dear Son Jeſus Chriſt, and to drink his Blood in theſe holy myſteries*; the 2d omits theſe words [*in theſe holy myſteries.*]

But the Divines of Qu. *Elizabeth* in their Review, as they nulled §. 3. n. 1.
the *Declaration* in the Common-Prayer Book, and purged the 28*th* Article of the forementioned explication; ſo they thought fit to reſtore the former ejected Form in the adminiſtring of the Sacrament. [*The Body of our Lord*, &c. *preſerve thy body and ſoul*,] putting after it the later Form, ---[*Take and eat this in remembrance*, &c. *and feed on him in thy heart with Faith and Thanksgiving.*] But then, the new *Liturgy* prepared for *Scotland*, and publiſhed *A. D.* 1637. rectifies and reduces many of the former things again to the firſt mode; firſt reſtores thoſe words in the Conſecration [*with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchſafe to bleſs*, &c. that *They may be unto us the Body*, &c.] ordering (again) the Presbyter that officiates, to take the Patin and Chalice in his hands; and then takes quite away the words added in King *Edward*'s ſecond Form in the delivering of the Myſteries [*Take and eat this*, &c.] and inſtead thereof adds after the former words [*The Body of our Lord*, &c.] the People's Reſponſe [*Amen*,] according to the cuſtom of *Antiquity*. (See *Dionyſ. Alexandr. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. 7. l. 8. c.* --- *Leo Serm. 6. de jejunio 7mi menſis.* --- Auguſtin. *ad Oroſium quæſt.* 49.) ſpoken as a Confeſſion of their Faith, that they acknowledged that, which they received, to be *Corpus Domini*. [Of all which *Laudenſium Autocatacriſis* heavily complains; obſerving ---- *That in the Conſecration-Prayer are reſtored the words of the* Maſs, *whereby God is beſought by his Omnipotent Spirit ſo to* Sanctifie *the oblation of* Bread *and* Wine, *that they may become to us* Chriſt's Body *and* Blood. *From which words* (ſaith he) *all Papiſts uſe to draw the truth of their* Tranſubſtantiation. *Wherefore the Engliſh Reformers* [*i. e.* the latter in King *Edward's* days] *ſcraped them out of their Books; but our Men put them fairly in. And good reaſon have they ſo to do. For long ago they profeſſed that, about the* Preſence *of* Chriſt's Body *and* Blood *in the Sacrament after Conſecration, they are fully agreed with Lutherans and Papiſts, except only about the formality and mode of Preſence*, [here quoting *Montague's Appeal*, p. 289.]

Laſtly, when the late Clergy *A. D.* 1661. being upon I know §. 3. n. 2.
not what inducements, ſolicited to receive the forementiond *De-*

cla-

claration rejected in Q. *Elizabeth*'s days, came to examine it, they judged meet not to publiſh it entire, as it ran before, but theſe words [*It is here declared, that no Adoration is intended or ought to be done unto any Real and Eſſential Preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood*] they cancelled; and inſtead of them inſerted theſe, [*It is here declared, that no Adoration is intended or ought to be done unto any Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and Blood,*] as we find them in the preſent *Rubrick*.

§. 4. Having exhibited this general view of the Mutations, which have been made in this Church in ſeveral times (according as different Judgments had the power) ſomewhat waveringly, it ſeems, in the things relating to ſo great an Article of Faith; I think fit now more particularly to reſume the conſideration of the *Declaration* about *Adoration*. In which are contained theſe three Obſervables.

1. Obſerv. 1. That here the preſent Clergy do profeſs expreſly, that *the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Chriſt, are not in the bleſſed Sacrament of the Euchariſt*.

§. 5. 2. Obſerv. 2. That they urge, for this Non-preſence there, this reaſon or ground out of Natural Philoſophy, That *it is againſt the truth of a Natural body, to be in more places than one at one time*; here ſeeming to found their Faith in this matter on the truth of this poſition in Nature.

§. 6. 3. Obſerv. 3. In conſequence of theſe, they declare; that kneeling in receiving the Euchariſt (ſo much excepted againſt by the Presbyterian) is meant *for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of ſuch prophanation and diſorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwiſe enſue, but that hereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done unto any corporal preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and blood*; where they either leave this undetermined, whether there be not another preſence of Chriſt's fleſh and blood, as real and true as is the corporal to which an adoration is at this time due: or elſe do determine as ſeems concludable from their former Propoſition, [viz. *That the natural Body of Chriſt is not there*] that there is not any ſuch real preſence of the Body at all, and ſo no adoration due in any ſuch reſpect.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Conſiderations on the firſt obſervable; The Natural Body and Blood of our Lord not preſent in the Euchariſt.

§. 7. NOW to repreſent to you, as clearly as I can, the doubts and difficulties, concerning all theſe three Obſervables in their order. As to the firſt of theſe; the Learned Proteſtant Writers ſeem to me, at leaſt in their moſt uſual expreſſions, to have heretofore delivered the contrary; *viz. That the very ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body, that his natural Body, that that very body that was born of the B. Virgin, and crucified on the Croſs,* &c. *is preſent, as in Heaven, ſo here in this Holy Sacrament, either to the worthy Receiver, or to the Symbols.*

§. 8. For which, Firſt ſee *Calvin*, whoſe Doctrine amongſt all the reſt (the *Roman*, *Lutheran*, or *Zuinglian*) the Church of *England* ſeems rather to have embraced and agreed with, eſpecially ſince the beginning of the Reformation of Q. *Elizabeth*. Thus therefore He, in 1 Cor. 11. 24. [Take eat, this is my Body.] *Neque enim mortis tantum & reſurrectionis ſuæ beneficium nobis offert Chriſtus, ſed corpus ipſum in quo paſſus eſt & reſurrexit,* [Corpus ipſum in quo paſſus eſt, that is ſurely his natural Body.] --- Again. *Inſtit.* 4. *l.* 17. *c.* 11. §. --- *Facti participes ſubſtantiæ ejus, virtutem quoque ejus ſentimus in bonorum omnium communicatione.* [Facti participes ſubſtantiæ ejus, i. e. of his natural ſubſtance, for no other humane ſubſtance he had, ſpiritual or corporal, than that only, which was born of the B. Virgin, and that is his natural ſubſtance.] ---and *Ib.* §. 19. --- *His abſurditatibus ſublatis, quicquid ad exprimendam veram* ſubſtantialemque *Corporis ac ſanguinis Domini Communicationem, quæ ſub ſacris cœnæ ſymbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere poteſt, libenter recipio.* --- *Ibid.* §. 16. --Of the *Lutherans* he ſaith: --- *Si ita ſenſum ſuum explicarent, dum panis porrigitur, annexam eſſe exhibitionem corporis, quia inſeparabilis eſt a ſigno ſuo veritas, non valde pugnarem.*

§. 9. And, to ſtrengthen further this aſſertion of *Calvin*, may be added the Confeſſion of *Beza*, and others of the ſame ſect, related by Hoſpinian, *hiſt. Sacram. parte altera*, p. 251. --- *Fatemur in Cœna Domini non modo omnia Chriſti beneficia, ſed ipſam etiam Filii hominis ſubſtantiam, ipſam, inquam, veram carnem, & verum illum ſanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non ſignificari duntaxat, aut ſymbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi, tanquam abſentis memoriam: ſed*

vere ac certo repræſentari, exhiberi, & applicanda offerri, adjunctis ſymbolis minime nudis, ſed quæ (quod ad Deum ipſum promittentem & offerentem attinet) ſemper rem ipſam vere ac certo conjunctam *habeant, ſive fidelibus, ſive infidelibus proponantur. Jam vero modum illum quo res ipſa i. e. verum corpus, & verus ſanguis Domini, cum ſymbolis copulatur, dicimus eſſe Symbolicum, ſive Sacramentalem: Sacramentalem autem modum vocamus, non qui ſit figurativus duntaxat, ſed qui vere & certo ſub ſpecie rerum viſibilium repræſentet, quod* Deus cum ſymbolis exhibet *& offert, nempe* (*quod paulo ante diximus*) verum corpus *& ſanguinem Chriſti; ut appareat, nos ipſius corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti* præſentiam in Cœna *retinere & defendere; & ſi quid nobis cum vere piis & doctis fratribus controverſiæ eſt, non de* re ipſa, *ſed de præſentiæ* modo *duntaxat, qui ſoli Deo cognitus eſt, & a nobis creditur, diſceptari.* [Here they ſay, rem ipſam, *i. e.* verum corpus & verum ſanguinem Domini cum ſymbolis copulari in Cœna Domini, modum vero eſſe ſymbolicum, *&c.*]

§. 10. Next to come to our Engliſh Divines. ---- Firſt ---- Thus Mr. *Hooker*, Eccl. Polit. 5. l. 67. §. p. 357. ---*Wherefore ſhould the world continue ſtill diſtracted and rent with ſo manifold contentions, when there remaineth now no controverſy, ſaving only about the ſubject, where Chriſt is: --- nor doth any thing reſt doubtful in this; but whether, when the Sacrament is Adminiſtred, Chriſt be whole within Man only, or elſe his body and blood be alſo externally ſeated in the very conſecrated elements themſelves.*

[This therefore was no doubt amongſt the divided parties in Mr. *Hooker*'s Judgment; *Whether Chriſt's natural body was only in Heaven, or both in Heaven and alſo in the Euchariſt.* (for if otherwiſe) this is ſo main a doubt that he ought not to have diſſembled it.]

---Again p. 360. --- *All three Opinions do thus far accord in one, --- That theſe holy Myſteries, received in due manner, do inſtrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood, which were given for the Life of the World; and beſides alſo impart unto us, even in true and real, tho' myſtical, manner, the very perſon of our Lord himſelf, whole, perfect, and entire.* ---and p. 359. --- *His body and his blood are in that very ſubject, whereunto they adminiſter Life, not only by effect, or operation, even as the influence of the Heavens is in Plants, Beaſts, Men, and in every thing which they quicken; but alſo by a far more divine and myſtical kind of Union, which maketh us one with him, even as he and the Father are one.*

Thus

2. Thus Biſhop *Andrews* in that much noted paſſage, *Reſp. ad Apoll. Bell.* 1. c. p. 11. --- *Quod Cardinalem non latet, niſi volentem & ultro, dixit Chriſtus,* Hoc eſt corpus meum; *non,* Hoc modo hoc eſt corpus meum. *Nobis autem vobiſcum de objecto convenit, de modo lis omnis eſt. De* hoc eſt, *fide firma tenemus, quod ſit: de,* hoc modo eſt *(nempe tranſubſtantiato in corpus pane) de modo, quo fiat, ut ſit* Per, *ſive* In, *ſive* Cum, *ſive* Sub, *ſive* Trans, *nullum inibi verbum eſt. Et quia verbum nullum, merito a fide ablegamus procul: inter ſcita Scholæ fortaſſe, inter Fidei articulos non, ponimus. Quod dixiſſe olim fertur* Durandus, *neutiquam nobis diſplicet,* Verbum audimus, motum ſentimus, modum neſcimus, præſentiam credimus. *Præſentiam, inquam, credimus, nec minus, quam vos, veram, De modo præſentiæ nihil temere definimus, addo, nec anxie inquiramus; non magis quam in baptiſmo noſtro, quomodo abluat nos ſanguis Chriſti: non magis quam in Chriſti incarnatione, quomodo naturæ divinæ humana in eandem hypoſtaſin uniatur. Inter myſteria ducimus (& quidem myſterium eſt Euchariſtia ipſa) cujus quod reliquum eſt debet igne abſumi, id eſt, ut eleganter in primis Patres, fide adorari, non ratione diſcuti.* ---Again, *Ib.* 8. c. p. 194. ſpeaking of the Conjunction of Chriſt's Body with the ſymbols, he ſaith, --- *Ea nempe conjunctio eſt inter Sacramentum viſibile, & rem Sacramenti inviſibilem; quæ inter humanitatem & divinitatem Chriſti, ubi niſi Eutychen ſapere vultis, humanitas in divinitatem non tranſubſtantiatur.* --- And a little farther, --- *Rex Chriſtum in Euchariſtia vere præſentem, vere & adorandum ſtatuit.* And ---*Nos vero in myſteriis carnem Chriſti adoramus, cum* Ambroſio, *&c.* [Here is ſuch a preſence of Chriſt's fleſh in the Euchariſt acknowledged, as is to be adored; and this it ſeems no leſs the Biſhop's Religion, than King *James*'s.] §. 11. n. 1.

Add to this, that paſſage in *Iſ. Cauſabon*'s Letter, written by the King's command to Card. *Perron*; who, when the Cardinal would have joined iſſue with the King, for trying the verity of the Real Preſence of Chriſts Body in the Euchariſt, in the King's name declines any ſuch Controverſy, and ſaying that the conteſt was not about *rei veritatem*, but only *modum*, returns this reply p. 50. --*Miratur vero ſereniſſimus Rex, cum fateatur tua illuſtris Dignitas, non πεοπεπεμένως quærere vos, ut credatur Tranſubſtantiatio, ſed ut de præſentiæ veritate ne dubitetur, Eccleſiam* Anglicanam, *quæ toties id ſe credere publicis ſcriptis eſt teſtata, nec dum vobis feciſſe ſatis:* and then, for explication of the Doctrine of the Engliſh Church in this matter, recites the forementioned words of Biſhop *Andrews*, ---*Quod Cardinalem non latet*, &c. §. 11. n. 2.

§. 12. 3. Thus Biſhop *Hall* in his Treatiſe *De pace Eccleſiaſtica* for reconciling the *Calviniſt* and *Lutheran* (which *Lutherans* undoubtedly hold the ſame natural body of *Chriſt* that is in Heaven to be alſo in the Euchariſt,) p. 78. --- *Res apud utroſque eadem, rei tantum ratio diverſa. Tantulum diſſidium fatemur quidem non eſſe nullius momenti; tanti eſſe, ut tam neceſſariam orbi Chriſtiano fratrum gratiam tam mirabiliter planeque divinitus coeuntem abrumpere debeat; id vero eſt, quod conſtantiſſime negamus. Neque nos ſoli ſumus in ea ſententia, Mitto Fratres* Polonos, Germanos, *noſtrarum partium*, &c. Then at laſt he brings in the decree of the Synod of the *French* Proteſtants at *Charenton*, in which the *Lutherans* are received to their communion, as agreeing with them *in omnibus veræ religionis principiis, articuliſque fundamentalibus.*

§. 13. 4. Thus Biſhop *Montague*, Appeal *p.* 289. --- *Concerning this point of Real Preſence, I ſay, that, if Men were diſpoſed as they ought, to peace, there need be no difference: for the diſagreement is only* de modo præſentiæ: *the thing is yielded to on either ſide*, that there is in the Holy Euchariſt a Real Preſence. *God forbid*, ſaith Biſhop Bilſon, *we ſhould deny that the fleſh and blood of Chriſt are truly preſent, and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's Table. It is the Doctrine that we teach others, and comfort our ſelves withal.* p. 779. Of true Subject: And the Reverend and Learned Anſwerer unto *Bellarmine*'s Apology, cometh home to the Faith (or Popery if you will) condemned in Mr. *Montague*, who learned it of him, and ſuch as he is. *Nobis vobis-cum de objecto convenit*, &c. ---[He, you ſee, repreſents the difference between parties in the ſame manner as Mr. *Hooker*; *i. e.* none as to the point of the preſence of the ſame body here in the Euchariſt, as it is at the ſame time above in Heaven.]

§. 14. 5. Thus Archbiſhop *Laud*, Confer. with *Fiſher*, §. 35. n. 3. --- *The worthy Receiver is, by his Faith, made ſpiritually partaker of the true and real body and blood of Chriſt, truly and really, and of all the benefits of his Paſſion. You Roman Catholicks add a manner of this his preſence (Tranſubſtantiation) which many deny; and the Lutherans a manner (Conſubſtantiation) which more deny.* ---And upon [*truly and really*] he notes in the Margin *Calvin*'s ſaying in 1 Cor. 11. 24. *Neque enim mortis tantum & reſurrectionis ſuæ beneficium nobis offert Chriſtus, ſed corpus ipſum, in quo paſſus eſt & reſurrexit.*

Ib. n. 7. Punct. 3. *I hope A. C. dare not ſay, that to believe the true ſubſtantial preſence of Chriſt is either known, or damnable Schiſm or Hereſie. Now as many and as Learned Proteſtants be-*

lieve,

lieve and maintain this, as do believe poſſibility of ſalvation in the Roman Church, &c. and *Ib. n.* 3. upon *Bellarmin*'s words --- *Converſionem Panis & Vini in corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti eſſe ſubſtantialem, ſed arcanam & ineffabilem,* he ſaith; *That if the Cardinal had left out* Converſion, *and affirmed only Chriſts* Real [by this he means *Subſtantial,* as alſo is affirmed by the Cardinal] *preſence there, after a myſterious and indeed an ineffable manner, no Man could have ſpoken better.* And --- §. 35. *6. n. Punct.* 4. quotes alſo Biſhop *Ridley*'s Confeſſion ſet down in *Fox,* p. 1598.) whoſe words are theſe: ---*You* [the Tranſubſtantialiſts] *and I agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and* natural Body *and* Blood *of* Jeſus Chriſt, *even that which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *which aſcended into Heaven, which ſits on the right hand of God the Father,* &c. *only we differ in* modo, *in the way and manner of being there.*

6. Thus Dr. *Taylor,* one of the laſt who hath written a juſt Treatiſe on this ſubject, 1. §. 11. *n. p.* 18. *It is enquired whether, when we ſay we believe Chriſt's Body to be really in the Sacrament, we mean that body, that fleſh, that was born of the Virgin* Mary, *that was crucified, dead and buried? I anſwer: I know none elſe that he had, or hath; there is but one body of Chriſt natural and glorified: but he that ſaith that body is glorified, which was crucified, ſays it is the ſame body, but not after the ſame manner; and ſo it is in the Sacrament, we eat and drink the body and blood of Chriſt that was broken and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood of Chriſt: but tho' it is the ſame we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore when any of the Proteſtant Divines, or any of the Fathers deny, that body which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *that was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament, as* Bertram, *as S.* Hierom, *as* Clemens Alexandrinus *expreſly affirm; the meaning is eaſie, they intend that it is not eaten in a natural ſenſe: and then calling Corpus* ſpirituale, *the word* ſpirituale *is not a ſubſtantial predication, but is an affirmation of the manner; tho' in diſputation it be made the Predicate of a Propoſition, and the oppoſite member of a Diſtinction. That Body which was crucified is not that body that is eaten in the Sacrament, if the intention of the Propoſition be to ſpeak of the eating it in the ſame manner of being; but that body which was crucified, the ſame body we do eat, if the intention be to ſpeak of the ſame thing in ſeveral manners of being and operating; and this I noted, that we may not be prejudiced by words, when the notion is certain and eaſie. And thus far is the ſenſe of our Doctrine in this Article.* [Here we ſee this Doctor becomes ſuch a zealous advocate §. 15.

of

of this Cauſe, as to frame an anſwer to all ſuch ſayings in the Fathers, as may ſeem by the expreſſion to import; as if the ſame body that was crucified were not eaten here by us in the Sacrament; *and defends the contrary.*] --- Again §. 12. *p.* 288. *They that do not confeſs the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of our Saviour, which fleſh ſuffered for us, let them be Anathema.* But *quo modo* is the queſtion, *&c.* See *p.* 5. where he will have *ſpiritual* preſence [*his Book bearing this Title* The Real Preſence and Spiritual of Chriſt, *&c.*] underſtood to be particular in nothing, but that it excludes the corporal and natural manner, [*not* ſpiritual *preſence therefore, ſo as to exclude* Corpus Domini, *but only the corporal or natural manner of that body:*] now by excluſion of the natural manner is not meant (ſurely) the excluſion of *nature*, or of the thing it ſelf, (for, then, to ſay a thing is there, after a natural manner, were as much as to ſay, the thing is not there:) but the excluſion of thoſe *properties* which uſually accompany nature, or the thing. ---See *p.* 12. where he allows of the term *ſubſtantialiter*; and of that expreſſion of Conc. Trid. *Sacramentaliter præſens Salvator noſter ſubſtantia ſua nobis adeſt.* ---and in the ſame page he ſaith, when the word *Real preſence* is denied by ſome Proteſtants, it is taken for *natural*, and not for *in rei veritate.*

§. 16. 7. Thus Biſhop *Forbes de Euchariſtia*, 2. l. 2. c. 9. §. ---- An *Chriſtus in Euchariſtia ſit adorandus, Proteſtantes ſaniores non dubitant. In ſumptione enim Euchariſtiæ* (*ut utar verbis Archiepiſcopi* Spalatenſis) *adorandus eſt Chriſtus vera latria, ſiquidem corpus ejus vivum & glorioſum miraculo quodam ineffabili digne ſumenti præſens adeſt, & hæc adoratio non pani, non vino, non ſumptioni, non comeſtioni, ſed ipſi corpori Chriſti immediate per ſumptionem Euchariſtiæ exhibito, debetur & perficitur.* --- And Ib. §. 8. ---- *Immanis eſt rigidorum Proteſtantium error, qui negant Chriſtum in Euchariſtia eſſe adorandum, niſi adoratione interna & mentali, non autem externo aliquo ritu adorativo, ut in geniculatione aut aliquo alio conſimili corporis ſitu; hi fere omnes male de præſentia Chriſti Domini in Sacramento, miro ſed vero modo præſentis, ſentiunt.* --Again 3. *l.* 1. *c.* §. 10. --- *Dicunt etiam ſæpiſſime ſancti Patres in Euchariſtia offerri & ſacrificari ipſum Chriſti Corpus, ut ex innumeris pene locis conſtat, ſed non proprie & realiter omnibus ſacrificii proprietatibus ſervatis; ſed per commemorationem & repræſentationem ejus quod ſemel in unico illo ſacrificio Crucis, quo alia omnia ſacrificia conſummavit Chriſtus ſummus Sacerdos noſter, eſt peractum; & per piam ſupplicationem, qua Eccleſiæ miniſtri propter unici illius ſacrificii perpetuam victimam, in Cœlis ad dextram Patris aſſiſtentem,*

&

& in ſacra menſa modo ineffabili præſentem, Deum Patrem humillime rogant, ut virtutem & gratiam hujus perennis victimæ, Eccleſiæ ſuæ, ad omnes corporis & animæ neceſſitates efficacem & ſalutarem eſſe velit. [Here is acknowledg'd, 1. Chriſti corpus in ſacra menſa modo ineffabili præſens. 2. Hoc corpus oblatum in Euchariſtia ut ſacrificium Deo Patri. 3. Ipſi corpori Chriſti ut præſenti in Euchariſtia miraculo quodam ineffabili, immediate debita adoratio varæ Latriæ.]

§. 17. 8. Thus the Archbiſhop of *Spalato* much-what to the ſame purpoſe, *de Rep. Eccl. 7. l. 11. c. 7. §. Si ſecundum veritatem qui digne ſumit ſacramenta corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, ille vere & realiter corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti, in ſe corporaliter, modo tamen quodam ſpirituali, miraculoſo & imperceptibili ſumit; omnis digne communicans adorare poteſt & debet corpus Chriſti quod recipit; non quod lateat corporaliter in pane, aut ſub pane, aut ſub ſpeciebus & accidentibus panis; ſed quod quando digne ſumitur panis Sacramentalis, tunc etiam ſumitur cum pane Chriſti corpus reale illi communioni realiter præſens.*

§. 18. 8. And thus Mr. *Thorndyke* in his Epilogue to the Tragedy, 3. *l.* 3. *c. p.* 17. --- *That which I have already ſaid is enough to evidence the myſtical and ſpiritual preſence of the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt in the Elements, as the Sacrament of the ſame, before any Man can ſuppoſe that ſpiritual preſence of them to the Soul, which the eating and drinking Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood ſpiritually by living Faith importeth.* ---and *Ib. 2. c. p.* 10. when it follows, He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's Body; *unleſs a Man diſcern the Lord's Body where it is not, of neceſſity it muſt there be where it is diſcerned to be,* &c. and 3. *l.* 23. *c. p.* 225. he ſaith, --- *That anciently there was a reſervation from Communion to Communion: and* --- *that he who carried away the Body of our Lord to eat it at home, drinking the Blood at preſent, might reaſonably be ſaid to communicate in both kinds. Neither can* (ſaith he) *that Sacramental change which the Conſecration works in the Elements be limited to the Inſtant of the Aſſembly: tho' it take effect only in order to that Communion, unto which the Church deſigneth that which it conſecrateth.* --- and 3. *l.* 5. *c. p.* 44. --- *Having maintained that the Elements are really changed, from ordinary Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt myſtically preſent as in a Sacrament, and that in virtue of the Conſecration, not by the Faith of him that receives; I am to admit and maintain whatſoever appears duly conſequent to this truth: namely, that the Elements ſo conſecrated are truly the ſacrifice of Chriſt*

upon

upon the Croſs, in as much as the Body and Blood of Chriſt are contained in them, &c. ---and then *p.* 46. he farther collecteth thus. ---*And the Sacrifice of the Croſs being neceſſarily propitiatory and impetratory both, it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, in as much as it is the ſame ſacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs, ---is alſo both propitiatory and impetratory.* --- and *3. l. 30. c. p.* 350. --*I ſuppoſe* (ſaith he) *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt may be adored whereſoever they are, and muſt be adored by a good Chriſtian, where the cuſtom of the Church, which a Chriſtian is obliged to communicate with, requires it.* -- And *p.* 351. --*Not to balk the freedom which hath carried me to publiſh all this; I do believe, that it was practiſed and done* [*i.e.* our Lord Chriſt really worſhipped in the Euchariſt] *in the ancient Church, which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Chriſt, obliging all to conform to it in all things within the power of it: I know the conſequence to be this, That there is no juſt cauſe why it ſhou'd not be done at preſent, but that cauſe which juſtifies the reforming of ſome part of the Church without the whole.* [Here is acknowledg'd, 1. Preſently upon Conſecration a preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood with, or in, the Elements, before any preſence of them to the Soul by a living Faith; of which body becoming here preſent, the unworthy Receivers are ſaid to be guilty, 1 *Cor.* 11. 22. 2. A permanency of this Body and Blood with theſe Symbols in the reſervation of them, after the aſſembly had communicated. 3. The Elements conſecrated, in as much as the Body and Blood of Chriſt is contained in them, affirmed to be truly the ſacrifice on the Croſs. 4. Adoration of this Body and Blood as ſo preſent, to be a duty, and antiently practiſed.]

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Conſiderations on the ſecond Obſervable, That a natural Body cannot be in many places at once.

THis I had to repreſent, and theſe witneſſes to produce againſt the firſt Obſervable; the profeſſion made in this Declaration, *That the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt are not in the Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt.* It were an eaſy task here to back the teſtimony of theſe Writers with thoſe of the Fathers to the ſame purpoſe; but I conceive it needleſs, ſince the ſame Proteſtant Writers here cited urge the authority of Antiquity, as a chief inducement and motive of this their Aſſertion. Now then to conſider the ſecond, the urging for ſuch Non-preſence, this reaſon; becauſe *it is againſt the truth of a natural Body to be,* or becauſe a natural Body cannot truly be, *in more places than one, at one time.* §. 19.

1. Here alſo, firſt, I find Proteſtants, and eſpecially our Engliſh Divines generally to confeſs the preſence of our Saviour in the Euchariſt to be an ineffable myſtery, (which I conceive is ſaid to be ſo in reſpect of ſomething in it *oppoſite* and contradictory to, and therefore incomprehenſible and ineffable by, humane reaſon.) For this thus *Calvin* himſelf long ago, in the beginning of the Reformation, *Inſt. 4. l. 17. c. 24. §. Ego hoc myſterium minime rationis humanæ modo metior, vel naturæ legibus ſubjicio. --- Humanæ rationi minime placebit* [that which he affirms] *penetrare ad nos Chriſti carnem, ut nobis ſit alimentum. ——Dicimus Chriſtum tam externo ſymbolo, quam ſpiritu ſuo ad nos deſcendere, ut vere ſubſtantia carnis ſuæ animas noſtras vivificet. ——In his paucis verbis qui non ſentit multa ſubeſſe miracula, pluſquam ſtupidus eſt: quando nihil magis incredibile, quam res toto cœli & terræ ſpatio diſſitas ac remotas, in tanta locorum diſtantia, non tantum conjungi, ſed uniri; ut alimentum percipiant animæ ex carne Chriſti:* [Nihil magis incredibile; *therefore* not this more incredible, *that* Idem Corpus poteſt eſſe in diverſis locis ſimul.] --- And §. 32. --- *Porro de modo ſiquis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, ſublimius eſſe arcanum, quam ut vel meo ingenio comprehendi, vel enarrari verbis queat.* ——And §. 25. *Captivas tenemus mentes noſtras ne verbulo duntaxat obſtrepere, ac humiliamus ne inſurgere, audeant. ——Nec vero nefas nobis eſſe ducimus, ſanctæ Virginis exemplo, in re ardua ſciſcitari, quomodo fieri poſſit?* See more *Ibid.* §. 7. [Naturæ legibus non ſubjicio, ——humanæ rationi minime placet, ——quomodo fieri poteſt] ——Surely theſe argue ſomething in §. 20. n. 1.

it ſeemingly contradictory to nature and humane reaſon.

§. 20. n. 2. Thus King *James* of the *Euchariſt* in his anſwer to Cardinal *Perron* by *Cauſabon*. ——*Myſterium iſtud magnum eſſe humano ingenio incomprehenſibile, ac multo magis inenarrabile, Eccleſia Anglicana fatetur & docet.*

§. 20. n. 3. And thus ſpeaks Dr. *Taylor* in *Real preſence*, §. 11. *n.* 23. after that he had numbred up many apparent contradictions, not only in reſpect of a *natural*, but, as he ſaith, of an *abſolute*, poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation, (from *p.* 207. to *p.* 337.) *Yet* (ſaith he) *let it appear that God hath affirmed Tranſubſtantiation, and I for my part will burn all my arguments againſt it, and make publick amends:* [all my arguments, *i. e.* of apparent Contradictions and abſolute Impoſſibilities.] And *n.* 28. To this objection, *That we believe the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation, of our Saviour's being born of a pure Virgin*, &c. clauſo utero, *and of the Reſurrection with identity of bodies (in which the* Socinians *find abſurdities and contradictions) notwithſtanding ſeeming impoſſibilities; and therefore why not Tranſubſtantiation?* He anſwers, That *if there were as plain Revelation of Tranſubſtantiation, as of the other, then this Argument were good: and if it were poſſible for ten thouſand times more arguments to be brought againſt Tranſubſtantiation*, [of which ten thouſand then ſuppoſe that this be one, *That* Idem corpus non poteſt eſſe ſimul in duobus locis] *yet we are to believe the Revelation in deſpite of them all.* [Now none can believe a thing true, upon what motive ſoever, which he firſt knows certainly to be falſe, or, which is all one, certainly to contradict. For theſe, we ſay, are not verifiable by divine power, and *ergo* here, I may ſay, ſhould Divine Power declare a truth, it would tranſcend it ſelf.] ——Again, in *Liberty of Prophecy*, 20. §. 16. *n.* he ſaith, *Thoſe who believe the* Trinity *in all thoſe niceties of explication which are in the School, and which now adays paſs for the Doctrine of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the principles of natural and ſupernatural Philoſophy, as can be imagined to be in the point of Tranſubſtantiation.* Yet I ſuppoſe himſelf denies no ſuch doctrine about the Trinity, that is commonly delivered in the Schools.

§. 21. 2. I conceive, that any one thing that ſeemeth to us to include a perfect contradiction, can no more be effected by divine power, than another, or than many other the like may: therefore if theſe men do admit once, that ſome ſeeming contradiction to reaſon may yet be verified in this Sacrament, for which they call it an *ineffable myſtery*; I ſee not why they ſhould deny, that this particular ſeeming contradiction, among the reſt, *of the ſame body being at the ſame time in*

ſeveral

ſeveral places, yet by the divine power (I ſay not *is*, for the knowledge of this depends on Revelation, but) *may be*, ſo verified.

3. I cannot apprehend but that theſe Writers muſt hold this §. 22.
particular ſeeming contradiction, or ſome other equivalent to it, to be true; ſo long as they do affirm a *real* and *ſubſtantial preſence* of the very Body of Chriſt to the worthy communicant here on earth, contradiſtinct to any ſuch other real preſence, as implies only a preſence of Chriſt's Body in its *virtue*, *efficacy*, *benefits*, *ſpirit*, *&c.* which is the *Zuinglian real preſence*. For ſuppoſe our Saviour's Body to be (as they will have it) only *naturally* or *locally* in heaven; yet if the *ſubſtance*, the *eſſence*, the *reality* of this Body (however ſtript of its natural properties, all ſuch as being not the very eſſence of it, are removeable from it *per potentiam divinam*) be here on earth in the Euchariſt, when it is alſo in Heaven, (be it here preſent to the *ſymbols*, or to the *receiver*, or to any thing elſe, it matters not:) we muſt affirm that this *eſſence* or *ſubſtance* of the ſame body at leaſt is at the ſame time in divers *places*; or (if we will have this eſſence to be in heaven only, as in a place) in divers *ubi*'s, which is every whit as ſeeming contradictory as the other. And whoever will grant, that an *Angel* by divine power may be at the ſame time in two ſeveral *ubi*'s, cannot reaſonably deny, that a *body* may be ſo, in ſeveral *places*; or in one *place*, and in another *ubi*. I ſay then, that this Propoſition, [*That the ſame Body is at the ſame time in divers places*,] or another equivalent to it, muſt be conceded to be true, ſo long as we affirm the eſſence of our Saviour's body to be here on Earth in the Euchariſt at the ſame time, as it is alſo in Heaven; unleſs we defend one of theſe two things; either,

1. *That this Body is both here and there by an incomprehenſible conti-* §. 23.
nuation, as it were, thereof, (which ſounds ſomewhat like the *ubiquity* of ſome *Lutherans*) for which ſee the words of *Calvin* quoted before, §. 8. *Res toto cœli & terræ ſpatio diſſitas ac remotas conjungi & uniri*, &c. words uſher'd in by him with a *nihil magis incredibile*. [But then, as ſome ſeem thus to make Chriſt's Body that is in Heaven, by a certain prolonging or *continuation* incomprehenſible (as their expreſſions ſeem to import) to be joyned, upon an act of faith, to the Soul of the worthy Receiver here on Earth, whilſt yet the ſame body is ſtill only in Heaven, and there no way at all enlarged in its dimenſions; ſo why may not others as probably make the ſame body that is in Heaven, by a certain *diſcontinuation* ineffable, to be preſent here on Earth, upon the act of Conſecration, to the ſymbols or receiver, tho' it be in both theſe places only the ſame body ſtill, and not multiplied in its eſſence? As the ſame *Soul* is

totally in the Head and the Foot; yet this Soul not continued in theſe two places or *Ubi*'s, neither by its parts, ſince it hath none; nor by two totals, ſince in both it is but one: and ſuppoſe one foot of this body doth ſtand in the water, the other on the land; the ſame Soul being totally in both theſe feet, conſequently, will be totally in the water, and totally not in the water, but on the land. And ſuppoſe again the two feet cut off from the body, and yet preſerved ſtill alive, *i. e.* the ſoul, that did before, ſtill informing them *per potentiam divinam*, (which we ſee naturally done in many Inſects:) the ſame Soul will be now, totally in the water, and totally on the land, without continuation (if I may ſo ſay) of it ſelf. And ſuppoſe again this body, which it informs, to increaſe to a much greater bulk; and the ſame Soul will be now in many more places than formerly without any augmentation of it ſelf. And why the ſame things may not be ſaid of *Bodies*, when ſtript of quantitative dimenſions; or how far ſome properties of Spirits may be communicated to them, (*ſalva eſſentia corporis*) who can ſay? What our Saviour ſaid to the *Sadduces* reluctting to believe a revelation concerning the reſurrection of the ſame numerical body, becauſe involving in it very many ſeeming contradictions, *Erratis, neſcientes Scripturas, neque virtutem Dei*, may as well be ſaid in this great myſtery of the Euchariſt.]

Matth. 22. 29.

§. 24. n. 1. Or 2*ly*, unleſs we will explain our ſelves, that, by the *eſſential, real, ſubſtantial preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, we mean only the preſence of the true and real effect, bleſſing, virtues*, of this Body, (as Dr. *Taylor* ſometimes ſeems to do,) but this is, after profeſſing with the higheſt in our *words*, a relapſing into *Zuinglianiſm* in our *ſenſe*. [I will ſet you down the Doctor's words, (*Real Preſence* §. 11. *n.* 17.) where, after he hath ſaid, *That there is not in all School-Divinity, nor in the old Philoſophy, nor in nature, any more than three natural proper ways of being in a place*, circumſcriptive, definitive, repletive, and that the Body of *Chriſt* is not in the Sacrament any of theſe three ways, (quoting *Turrecremata* for it) he replies thus to thoſe Schoolmen, that rejecting theſe three ways, do ſay, that *Chriſts* Body is in a fourth way, viz. *Sacramentally* in more places than one. ——*This*, ſaith he, *is very true; that is, that the Sacrament of Chriſt's body is* [in more places than one]; *and ſo is his Body* [in more places than one] *figuratively, tropically, repreſentatively in being* [*or* eſſence,] *and really in* effect *and* bleſſing. *But this is not a natural real being in a place, but a relation to a perſon.* Thus he. But if thus Chriſt's Body be held by us, as to its eſſence, only *figuratively, tropically*, and re-

pre-

preſentatively in more places than one; and *really* in thoſe places only in its *effect* and *bleſſing*, what will become of our ——*præſentiam non minus quam illi veram*, (ſee before, §. 11.) if others hold the preſence of Chriſt's very *eſſence* and *ſubſtance* in the Euchariſt, we only the preſence there of its *effect* and *bleſſing*?

Now as to the proper *mode* (which the Dr. here agitates) of Chriſt's Body being ſubſtantially in the Sacrament, whether it is *circumſcriptive*, *definitive*, or ſome other way; it is true, that the Schoolmen do not all agree on one and the ſame. S. *Thomas*, *Durand*, and ſeveral others, deny the Body of Chriſt to be either *circumſcriptive*, or *definitive* in this Sacrament, and proceed to affirm, That *Idem Corpus non poteſt, per miraculum*, or *potentiam divinam, eſſe in pluribus locis ſimul*, i. e. *localiter*, or, in the forementioned ways, Circumſcriptively or Definitively.

But you may note, 1. That they take *circumſcriptive*, and *definitive*, in ſuch a ſenſe, as that theſe two do exclude, not only ſuch a bodies being *ubique*, every where; but abſolutely its being *alibi*, any where elſe; and that theſe modes of Preſence would infer, That the ſame individual is divided from it ſelf, (contrary to the nature of *individuum*, or *unum*,) if ſuch body ſhould at that time be any where elſe. See S. *Thom.* Suppl. q. 83. Art. 5. ad 4um ——and 3^a^ q. 76. Art. 5. where he ſaith, That that is *circumſcriptive in loco, quod nec excedit, nec exceditur.* ——And ſee *Durand*, his follower, in 4. *ſent.* 44. *d. q.* 6. where he argueth very clearly thus: —— *Exiſtentia unius corporis ſimul in pluribus locis implicat expreſſe contradictionem; quia illud quod eſt circumſcriptive in diſtantibus locis, oportet quod ſit diſtinctum diſtinctione locorum; quia quicquid eſt circumſcriptive in loco aliquo, totum continetur ab ipſo, ita quod nihil contenti eſt circumſcriptive extra continentem. Propter quod illa quæ ſunt in diſtinctis locis circumſcriptive, neceſſario diſtincta ſunt; &, quia eſt contra rationem unius quod ſit diſtinctum, ideo ſi unum corpus eſſet in pluribus locis circumſcriptive, eſſet unum & non unum ſeu indiſtinctum; quod implicat contradictionem.* §. 24. n. 2.

2. That they put a third way of preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, real and true, and tho' not *per modum quantitatis dimenſive*, yet *per modum ſubſtantiæ* *, which they ſay is a mode proper to this Sacrament, and ſuch as hinders not the ſame body at the ſame time to be *alibi*, elſewhere, and yet to remain, tho' it be elſewhere, *indiviſum in ſe*: which the other Preſences, in their acception of them, do hinder. Of which thing thus *Durand* contends *, That Chriſt's Body is preſent in the Sacrament *ratione ſolius præſentiæ ad locum*, not *ratione continentiæ* either *circumſcriptive* §. 24. n. 3.

* Aqui. n. 3. 76. q. 3. art.

* In 4. ſent. 11. d. q. 1.

or

or *definitive*;---and that *Quod eſt præſens loco hoc modo, poteſt eſſe ſimul præſens in pluribus locis*; *ſicut Angelus*, ſaith he, *eſt præſens omnibus corporibus quæ poteſt movere.*

§. 24. n. 4. Mean-while other Schoolmen and Controvertiſts take liberty to diſſent from theſe. See *Scotus* in 4. *ſent. diſt.* 10. *q.* 2. and *Bellarm. de Euchar.* 3. *l.* 3. *c.* and it ſeems not without reaſon. For, why ſhould this their *Subſtantial* or *Sacramental* way (as real and true as any of the other) of Chriſt's Body being at the ſame time in Heaven and in the Euchariſt, conſiſt with this Body's remaining *individuum in ſe*; more than the *circumſcriptive* or *definitive* way, rightly underſtood, and freed of their limitations; or, why impoſe they ſuch a notion on theſe two ways, that they muſt imply an exact adequation of the place and the placed, or exclude it from being at all any where elſe; any more than the other Subſtantial or Sacramental way (which they maintain) doth?

Thus far I have ſtept aſide, to ſhew, that the Doctor receives no advantage here, for the denying the Eſſential or Subſtantial preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, from the difference in the Schools concerning the *Mode* thereof, whilſt all of them agree both in ſuch Subſtantial preſence, and alſo in Tranſubſtantiation.

§. 25. Conſequently to what hath been ſaid I gather alſo, Firſt, That if we do not take *præſentia corporalis*, or *præſentia naturalis* in ſuch a ſenſe as they imply the preſence of ſome *corporal* or *natural* accidents or properties by divine power ſeparable (as ſome are, the eſſence ſtill preſerved, and who knows exactly how many: in which reſpect Chriſt's Body is denied, as by the *Engliſh*, ſo by the *Roman* and *Lutheran* Churches, to be in the Euchariſt *modo corporeo*, or *naturali:*) but take them as they imply the *corporal or natural preſence of the eſſence or ſubſtance* of this Body; thus will *Real or Eſſential* Preſence be the ſame with *corporal* and *natural*. And therefore theſe words [*Real and eſſential preſence*] ſeem as truly denied to be in the Euchariſt, by the firſt compoſers of the foreſaid Declaration in the latter end of K. *Edward*'s days, as the words [*Corporal* and *Natural preſence*] are in this 2*d*. Edition thereof in *A. D.* 1661. I ſay the one, the *eſſential* or *ſubſtantial*, denied to be there, as much as the other, the *natural:* whenever this reaſon in both is added for it, *viz.* becauſe, *Idem corpus non poteſt eſſe ſimul in diverſis locis*. For this reaſon ſeems neceſſarily to exclude the one, as well as the other, the *real* and *eſſential* preſence, as well as *corporal* and *natural*.

§. 26. Indeed the preſent Rubrick hath only theſe words, [*That no adoration ought to be done unto any* corporal *preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and blood,*] whereas that in King *Edward*'s time hath theſe,

[*That*

[*That no adoration ought to be done unto any* real *and* eſſential *preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and blood,*] the words *Real* and *eſſential* then, being now changed into *Corporal*; and this ſeems to be done with ſome caution for the preſent Church her maintaining ſtill a *real* and *eſſential* preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt; whereas thoſe in the latter time of King *Edward* ſeem to have denied it. [For as the firſt days of this Prince ſeem to have been more addicted to *Lutheraniſm*, ſo the latter days to *Zuinglianiſm*; as appears in ſeveral expreſſions of Biſhop *Ridley*, (ſee his laſt examination in *Fox* p. 1598. and his ſtating the firſt Queſtion diſputed at *Oxford* about the Real Preſence,) and of *Peter Martyr*.* When alſo this Queſtion, *An Corpus Chriſti realiter vel ſubſtantialiter adſit in Euchariſtia*, in *Oxford*, was held negatively; and when all thoſe alterations were made in the Form of the Service of our Lord's Supper (mentioned before in the beginning of this Diſcourſe) that might ſeem to favour any preſence of Chriſt's Body in relation to the Symbols.] But here I ſay, if the words of the former Rubrick, *real* and *eſſential*, were by the late Clergy changed into *corporal* on any ſuch deſign, that ſo the real and eſſential preſence might be ſtill by them maintained; then I ask here, how can the ſame reaſon be ſtill retained in their opinion thus altered? For, this reaſon, [*that the ſame body cannot be at once in ſeveral places*] as I have ſaid, combats as well a *real* and *eſſential* preſence, which they now would ſeem to allow, as a *corporal*, which they reject.

* See Diſput. *Oxon.* 1549. fol. 18, 67, & 83.

2. I infer; that let them expreſs this eſſential or ſubſtantial §. 27. preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt, ſtill defended by them, how they pleaſe, by calling it *Myſtica*, *Spiritualis*, *Symbolica*, *Sacramentalis*, or the like; yet if the preſence of the Eſſence or Subſtance be ſtill retained, they are eaſed no more thus, from maintaining, that *Idem corpus poteſt eſſe in duobus locis* (or *ubi*) *ſimul*, than any other party, which hold any groſſer preſence there. And therefore ſuppoſe, if you will, a body cloath'd with all its uſual accidents of quantity and dimenſions, and of quality (except you will number alſo this amongſt them, to *poſſeſs but one place*, and except you will annex to *circumſcriptive* or *definitive* the reſtrictions mentioned before §. 24. *n.* 2.) and it may no leſs (when ſuch is the divine pleaſure) be, thus, at the ſame time in many places, than when ſtript of them: for the ſame ſeeming abſurdities and contradictions follow, from an Angel's, or Soul's being at the ſame time in two diſtinct definitive *ubi*'s; without any continuation (if I may ſo ſay) of its eſſence between theſe *ubi*'s; as do follow from a body ſo qualified being in two circumſcriptive places, without the like

like continuation; as you may ſee in peruſing the common objections that are made againſt plurality of places.

De Euchar. l. 3. c. 3. For as Cardinal *Bellarmin* preſſeth well to this purpoſe: ——*Si quis objiciat aliam eſſe rationem corporum, aliam ſpirituum, is facile refelli poteſt. Nam ratio cur corpora non videantur poſſe eſſe in pluribus locis non tam eſt moles quam unitas.* ——*Ideo autem non videtur poſſe eſſe, quia non poteſt divilli a ſeipſo: & videtur neceſſario debere divilli ac diſtrahi a ſe, ſi ponatur in variis locis. Porro iſta repugnantia quæ ſumitur ab unitate rei non minus invenitur in ſpiritu quam in corpore: utrumque enim eſt unum, & a ſe dividi non poteſt. Quare perinde eſt in hac quæſtione ſive de* Corpore *ſive de* Spiritu *probetur*, [and I add, ſive de corpore *eſſentiali*, ſive de *naturali*.] The like things he ſaith of a Sacramental preſence, and not *per occupationem loci*; ſo this preſence be real. *Quæ realis præſentia*, ſaith he, *in tot Altaribus & non in locis intermediis non minus tollere videtur indiviſionem rei, quam repletio plurium locorum.*

§. 28. This being ſaid from §. 22. That, in my apprehenſion either theſe our *Engliſh* Divines muſt affirm this Propoſition of *one body at the ſame time being in more places than one*, or ſome other equivalent to it, to be true; or muſt ceaſe to aſſert any *real*, *eſſential*, or *ſubſtantial* preſence of Chriſts body in the Euchariſt, contradiſtinct to the Senſe of the *Zuinglians*.

4. It ſeems to me, that ſome of the more judicious amongſt them heretofore have not laid ſo great weight on this Philoſophical poſition, as wholly to ſupport and regulate their faith in this matter by it, as it ſtands in oppoſition not only to nature's, but the divine power: becauſe they pretend not any ſuch certainty thereof; but that, if any divine revelation of the contrary can be ſhewed, they profeſs a readineſs to believe it.

§. 29. See the quotations out of Dr. *Taylor* before §. 20. *n.* 3. And thus Biſhop *White* againſt *Fiſher* p. 179. much-what to the ſame purpoſe. ——*We cannot grant* (ſaith he) *that one Individual body may be in many diſtant places at one and the ſame inſtant, until the Papiſt demonſtrate the poſſibility hereof by teſtimony of Sacred Scripture, or the antient Tradition of the Primitive Church, or by apparent reaſon.* And *p.* 446. ——*We diſpute not what God is able to effect by his abſolute power, neither is this queſtion of any uſe in the matter now in hand.* ——*That God changeth the Ordinance which himſelf hath fixed, no divine teſtimony or revelation affirmeth or teacheth. There is a Twofold power in God,* ordinata, *and* abſoluta. *One according to the order which himſelf hath fixed by his Word and Will, the other according to the infiniteneſs of his eſſence. Now according to the*

the power meaſured and regulated by his Word and Will, all things are impoſſible which God will not have to be. —— and p. 182. —— *Except God himſelf had expreſly revealed and teſtified in his Word, that the contrary* [*i. e.* to the common ordinance of the Creator] *ſhould be found in the humane body of Chriſt*, &c. *a Chriſtian cannot be compelled to believe this Doctrine as an Article of his Creed upon the ſole voice and authority of the* Lateran *or* Tridentine *Council.* [But if they were certain of ſuch contradiction, then are they certain that there neither is nor can be ſuch contrary revelation; and when any revelation, tho' never ſo plain, is brought, they are bound to interpret it ſo, as not to affirm a certainly known impoſſibility.]

Again, thus Biſhop *Forbes* de Euchar. 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 1. §. cenſures thoſe §. 30.
other Proteſtants, who peremptorily maintain that there is ſuch a real certain contradiction. ——*Admodum periculoſe & nimis audacter negant multi* Proteſtantes, *Deum poſſe panem ſubſtantialiter in corpus Domini convertere*, [which converſion involves the putting idem corpus ſimul in diverſis locis.] *Multa enim poteſt Deus omnipotens facere ſupra captum omnium hominum, imo & Angelorum. Id quidem quod implicet contradictionem non poſſe fieri concedunt omnes: ſed quia in particulari nemini evidenter conſtat, quæ ſit uniuſcujuſque rei eſſentia, ac proinde quid implicet, & quid non implicet contradictionem; magnæ profecto temeritatis eſt, propter cæcæ mentis noſtræ imbecillitatem, Deo limites præſcribere, & præfracte negare omnipotentia ſua illum hoc vel illud facere poſſe: Placet nobis judicium Theologorum* Wirtenbergicorum *in Confeſſione ſua, Anno* 1552. *Concilio* Tridentino *propoſita, cap.* de Euchariſtia, *(vide* Harmon. Confeſ.) *Credimus*, inquiunt, *omnipotentiam Dei tantam eſſe, ut poſſit in Euchariſtia ſubſtantiam panis & vini vel annihilare, vel in corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti mutare. Sed quod Deus hanc ſuam abſolutam omnipotentiam in Euchariſtia exerceat, non videtur eſſe certo verbo Dei traditum, & apparet veteri Eccleſiæ fuiſſe ignotum.* After which the ſame Biſhop goes on to ſhew the moderation alſo of ſome foreign reformed Divines herein, tho' much oppoſing the *Lutheran* and *Roman* opinion. Zuinglius & Oecolampadius, *(*ſaith he*) aliquoties, ut conſtat, conceſſerunt* Luthero *& illius ſequacibus, ac proinde Romanenſibus, (ut qui idem non minore contentione urgent in Tranſubſtantiatione ſua defendenda, quam illi in Conſubſtantiatione ſua) Deum quidem hoc poſſe efficere, ut unum corpus ſit indiverſis locis; ſed quod idem in Euchariſtia fieret, & quod Deus id fieri vellet, id vero ſibi probari poſtularunt. Utinam hic pedem fixiſſent, nec ulterius progreſſi fuiſſent diſcipuli. In Coll.* Malbrunnenſi *actione* 8. Jacobo Andreæ Lutherano *objicienti* Calviniſtas *negare Chriſti corpus*

cæleſti modo pluribus in locis eſſe poſſe, ita reſpondet Zach. Urſinus *Theol.* Heidelburgenſis: *Non negamus eum ex Dei omnipotentia pluribus in locis eſſe poſſe; hoc in controverſiam non venit, ſed an hoc velle Chriſtum ex verbis ejus probari poſſit? Itaque hoc te velle exiſtimavimus Chriſti corpus non tantum poſſe, ſed etiam reipſa oportere in S. Cœna præſens eſſe,* &c. *v. Urſ.* &c. p. 155. *Idem Urſinus Action.* ead. p. 153. *Conaberis etiam oſtendere* (alloquitur *Jacobum Andream*) *elevari & imminui a nobis omnipotentiam Dei, cum dicamus Deum non poſſe facere, ut corpus in pluribus ſit locis, aut ut Chriſti corpus per lapidem penetret* [the like contradictions ſeeming to *Urſin* to urge, both plurality of places to one Body, and plurality of Bodies to one place:] *De quo reſponſum eſt, non ſemel, nunquam quæſitum eſſe aut diſputatum, an* poſſit. *Deus hoc aut illud efficere; ſed hoc tantum, an ita* velit. —— See more in the Author. To which I may add S. *Auſtin*'s ſaying, *Cura pro mortuis*, c. 16. *Ista Quæſtio vires intelligentiæ meæ vincit, quemadmodum opitulentur Martyres iis, quos per eos certum eſt adjuvari: utrum ipſi per ſeipſos adſint uno tempore tam diverſis locis & tanta inter ſe longinquitate diſcretis,* &c. or whether this was done *per Angelica miniſteria uſquequaque diffuſa,* ſhews this Father believed no impoſſibility of a Martyrs being *uno tempore in diverſis locis.*

§. 31. And from this reaſon of their uncertainty of ſuch contradiction, whether it is real in reſpect of the *divine* power, it ſeems to be, that the Convocation of the Clergy in the beginning of Q. *Elizabeth*'s days, both caſt out of the 28 of the former *Articles* of Religion, made in the end of King *Edward*'s Reign, theſe words following: [---*Cum naturæ humanæ veritas requirat, ut unius ejuſdemque hominis corpus in multis locis ſimul eſſe non poſſit, ſed in uno aliquo & definito loco eſſe oporteat; idcirco Chriſti corpus in multis & diverſis locis eodem tempore præſens eſſe non poteſt. Et quoniam, ut tradunt ſacræ literæ, Chriſtus in cœlum fuit ſublatus, & ibi uſque ad finem ſæculi eſt permanſurus, non debet quiſquam fidelium carnis ejus & ſanguinis realem præſentiam & corporalem* (*ut loquuntur*) *præſentiam in Euchariſtia vel credere vel profiteri.*] And alſo caſt out this very Rubrick or Declaration out of the then Common-prayer book; and alſo reſtored again the former Form in adminiſtring the Communion; [*The Body of our Lord,* &c. *preſerve thy body and ſoul,*] *and all this* (ſaith Dr. *Heylin*) * *leſt under colour of rejecting a Carnal, they might be thought alſo to deny ſuch a Real preſence, as was defended in the writings of the ancient Fathers.*

* Hiſt. of Reform. Q. Eliz. p. 11.

§. 32. And laſtly, the late Clergy alſo in 1661, in that part of this received Rubrick or *Declaration* wherein they reject the words of

the

the former, [*real and eſſential preſence,*] as is ſaid before, §. 3. *n.* 4. ſeem to diſallow the opinion of K. *Edward*'s latter Clergy, and to vindicate ſtill the *real* preſence: but then, they retaining ſtill unchanged the laſt expreſſions of the former Rubrick, which affirm Chriſt's natural Body not to be in the Euchariſt, and that upon ſuch a ground as is there given, ſeem again to diſclaim it; unleſs they will juſtifie as ſeeming a contradiction as that is of *idem in pluribus locis ſimul*; which they condemn. A *contradiction*, I ſay; for I cannot diſcern, how this [*Chriſt's natural body is here, and is in Heaven, and yet but one body,*] can be pronounced a contradiction: and this [*Chriſt's natural body is not here, but only in Heaven, and yet this natural body is here moſt certainly received*] can be pronounced none. For if this can be juſtified to be part of their Faith, that the natural body of Chriſt is not here in the Euchariſt, but only in *Heaven*; yet this is another part thereof, (ſee the former Teſtimonies §. 8. *&c.*) that the natural body of Chriſt is here in the Euchariſt received. *It*, the *body* that was born of the B. Virgin, not a *grace* only, not a *ſpirit* only, but *it* it ſelf, for both *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, and the general Tradition of the ancient Church, ſeems to have neceſſitated theſe Divines to this expreſſion, and ---*facti participes ſubſtantiæ ejus virtutem quoque ejus ſentimus in bonorum omnium communicatione*, ſaith *Calvin*, quoted before, §. 8. ——Now if theſe things be ſo, then this expreſſing only of one part of their faith in this Rubrick, viz. *that the natural body is not here*, and the not mentioning the other part with it, viz. *that the naturul body notwithſtanding is here received by every worthy Communicant*, (it matters not after what manner received, ſo this manner deny not the preſence of this body) ſeems at leaſt to betray their Faith to a dangerous miſconſtruction, and to precipitate him, who hears ſuch a confeſſion, into *Zuinglianiſm*. But if we would expreſs our whole and entire Faith here concerning this matter, it cannot be, but that he, who hears it, (obſerving that both Chriſt's body *is here*, for he really receives it; and *not here*, for it is only in Heaven; in that it is both within him, and at the ſame time many millions of miles from him, and yet cannot poſſibly be at two places at once;) will preſently ſay with *Calvin*, * S. Virginis exemplo, *Quomodo fieri poſſit?* ---&--- *Nihil magis incredibile*, ---and then I ſee not what they have to anſwer him, but ---*Myſterium*, ---*Arcanum*, ---*Miraculum*, --- *Ineffabile*. And then how can they urge others (as they do here) with contradictions and impoſſibilities, who go about to explain this ineffable myſtery by *Idem corpus in pluribus locis*; and mean while maintain the like contradictions

* See before §. 20.

themſelves, deſiring to have *their* contradiction paſſed and currant; the *others* ſuppreſſed?

§. 33. To expreſs my diſquiſitions yet a little more fully, and to ſee if they can poſſibly find any evaſion (without retiring to *Zuinglianiſm*) from thoſe difficulties *themſelves*, with which here they preſs *others*. If they ſay, that Chriſt's Body is really or eſſentially preſent in the Euchariſt, but they mean not to the Elements, but to the Receiver; and that not to his Body, but to his Soul; yet if they affirm it as much, or as far preſent to the Soul, as others do to the ſigns, (as Mr. *Hooker* ſaith, *they differ only about the ſubject, not the preſence:*) do not the ſame objections, abſurdities, *&c.* (concerning Chriſt's being both really and eſſentially in Heaven, and in the place where the Communion is celebrated) with which they afflict others for making it preſent with the ſigns, return upon themſelves, for making it preſent with the Receiver? For if it be poſſible, that the Body of Chriſt, now ſitting at the right hand of God in Heaven, can, notwithſtanding this, be preſent in our Soul, or in our Heart in ſuch a place on Earth; ſo may it *under*, *with*, or *inſtead* of Bread in the ſame place; unleſs we ſay that they affirm not the real preſence to the Soul, which the others do to the Bread. But then theſe writers muſt not ſay, that they differ only about the manner, or the ſubject of his Preſence; but the Preſence it ſelf alſo.

§. 34. If they ſay that Chriſt's Body is really or eſſentially preſent in the Euchariſt; but they mean *ſpiritually*, not *naturally*, or not *corporally*; ſo ſay others, both *Romaniſt* and *Lutheran*; i. e. not with the uſual accidents or qualities accompanying (where is no ſupernatural effect) the nature or eſſence of a Body: but if they will extend *ſpiritually* ſo far as that it ſhall imply Chriſt's Body to be there *really* and *eſſentially*, yet not to be there *quoad naturam* or *eſſentiam ſuam*; or Chriſt's Body to be there, not *quoad corpus*; this is, by a diſtinction to deſtroy the *theſis*.

§. 35. Again, if they ſay *really* and *eſſentially* there preſent, but not *locally*; ſo ſay the *Lutheran*, and *Roman* Doctors, *i. e. circumſcriptive*, or by ſuch commenſuration to place, as bodies uſe to have in their natural condition: but if they will extend *locally* ſo far, as that they underſtand Chriſt's Body to be there by no manner of *ubi* at all, not ſo much as *ubi definitive*, or ſo that they may truly ſay 'tis *hic*, ſo, as not *ubique*, or not *alibi*, where no Communion is celebrated; what is this, but to affirm, 'tis there ſo, as that it is not at all there?

§. 36. If they ſay *really* and *eſſentially* preſent, *by reaſon of the ſame Spirit uniting us here on Earth, as members to it in Heaven:* beſides that thus

thus Chriſt's Body is no more preſent in the Euchariſt, than in any other Ordinance or Sacrament, wherein the Spirit is conferred; ſuch preſence is properly of the *Spirit*, not of the *Body*; and advanceth us not beyond *Zuinglianiſm*.

But if at laſt they plainly interpret *real* and *eſſential* preſence, by Chriſt's being *preſent* (in corporal *abſence*) *to the worthy Receiver in all the benefits and effects thereof*; Thus alſo they ſlide back into *Zuinglianiſm*. Concerning which opinion the Remonſtrants well diſcerning the difficulties, into which the affirming of a Real preſence doth caſt other Proteſtant parties, in their *Apol. pro Confeſſione ſua*, p. 256. ſaid; the *Zuinglian* opinion was, *ſimpliciſſima, & ad idololatriam omnem evitandam in hac materia in primis neceſſaria,* ——*& quæ a* Calvino *& illius ſequacibus dicuntur, manifeſtam in ſe continere tum vanitatem, tum abſurditatem; & ex iſto fonte emanaſſe ingentem illam idololatriam*, &c. And upon the ſame terms the *Socinians* reject *Calvin*'s Doctrine; See *Volkelius* 4. *l.* 22. *c. p.* 316. ——*Tertius error eorum eſt, qui Chriſti corpus ſanguinemque re-vera quidem in ſacra cœna a nobis comedi bibique exiſtimant: verum non corporali, ſed ſpirituali ratione hoc a nobis fieri affirmant. Cujus quidem opinionis falſitas vel hoc uno convincitur, quod non ſolum Chriſti verbis nequaquam continetur; ſed etiam cum ſanæ mentis ratione pugnat: quæ dictat, fieri non poſſe, ut Chriſti corpus tanto intervallo a nobis disjunctum in cœna re-vera comedamus. Idcirco & ille ipſe* [Calvinus] *qui ſententiæ iſtius author eſt, fatetur, ſe hoc myſterium nec mente percipere, nec lingua explicare poſſe.* §. 37.

I find alſo a late Writer replying on this manner to his Adverſary *W. H.* urging, ——*That ſome of the Learned'ſt of the* Engliſh *Clergy confeſs the Holy Euchariſt, after Conſecration, to be really and truly our Saviour's Body; and therefore adore it; and for this cauſe diſown the New Rubrick, which ſaith,* Our Lord's Body is in Heaven, and not on the Altar; *telling us, that they acknowledge the Thing, only dare not be ſo bold as the Romaniſts to determine the Manner,* [a thing ſaid by Biſhop *Andrews* and others, in the former Teſtimonies.] I find him, I ſay, returning this anſwer, 1. To the *Rubrick*. ---*That this new Rubrick is but the old one reſtored*; [where he might have done well to have conſidered by whom it was alſo ejected, before its late reſtorement in *A. D.* 1661. *viz.* by the *Engliſh* Clergy; and that within a year or two after it firſt appeared a New Additional in King *Edward*'s ſecond Common-Prayer Book.] 2. To the *Perſons*. --- *If* (ſaith he) *you ſpeak true of them, what regard ſhould we have of the judgment of ſuch Clergy-men, as declare their aſſent and conſent to all things contained in, and preſcribed by, the Book of Common-Prayer,* §. 38. *Roman Tradition examined*, p. 12.

Prayer, and Articles of Religion; and yet diſown the Rubrick, and believe Tranſubſtantiation, and adore the Euchariſt as Chriſt's Body? Why do not you call ſuch the Roman *Clergy rather than the* Engliſh, *if they differ from you but only in a want of boldneſs to determine the Manner, whilſt they acknowledge the Thing? What if a Biſhop* Bramhall *will have the Pope to be* Principium Unitatis, *and take* Grotius *to be of the mind of the Church of* England; (*who would have* Rome *to be the Miſtreſs-Church, and the Pope to be the Univerſal Governor, according to the Canons of Councils, even the Council of* Trent;) *muſt we therefore ſtoop to ſuch mens judgments? Or might you not as well tell us, That* Caſſander *or* Militier, *yea or* Bellarmine, *were of your mind?* Thus he. But if the acknowledging an eſſential or ſubſtantial preſence of Chriſt's Body, or of his Fleſh and Blood that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, in the Euchariſt, and with the Symbols, tho' the manner not preſcribed, doth *Romanize* this Clergy; Biſhop *Couſins* is one of thoſe number. * And it is much, that this perſon, having read his Book, (who alſo, which I much wonder at, makes this his own opinion of an Eſſential preſence that of all Proteſtants) did not diſcern this; but hath in his Poſtſcript recommended for the ſatisfaction of others, one ſo much differing from his own Judgment; who ſpeaks of this preſence of our Lord much otherwiſe than the Biſhop, in this manner. *p.* 14. ——*That the Euchariſt is Chriſt's Body and Blood repreſentative; and not of ſuch a Body as he hath now glorified,* [which he denies to be fleſh and blood,] *but ſuch as was truly fleſh and blood, which he once offered; the* Benefits *of which Sacrifice are really given us in, and by, the Euchariſt.* And p. 15. ---*That our Lord at his laſt Supper ſpeaketh of a Repreſentative Body and Blood,* [*i. e.* in the words, Hoc eſt Corpus meum,] *when his real Body was not broken nor ſlain; nor his blood ſhed, till after.* And ---*I can ſcarce believe* (ſaith he) *that man, that ſaith he believeth, that they* [the Apoſtles] *believed, that then they did eat Chriſt's very Fleſh and Blood.* And elſewhere *, to St. *Cyril*'s words, [*Do not look on it as bare bread, and bare wine, for it is the Body and Blood of* Chriſt. *For tho' thy ſenſe ſuggeſts this to thee, yet let Faith confirm thee.*] he anſwers, *The Bread and Wine are not bare or meer Bread and Wine, but Chriſt's Body and Blood; as the King's Statue in Braſs is not bare braſs.* In all which we hear of the benefits of our Lord's Body and Blood, and of his Sacrifice on the Croſs, really given to us in the Euchariſt; but nothing of his very Fleſh and Blood really and eſſentially preſent there; a thing profeſſed abundantly by Biſhop *Couſins*.

* See the former Diſcourſe concerning the Euchariſt. §. 5. n. 2. &c.

* p. 57.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Conſiderations on the third Obſervation: No Adoration intended or due to any Corporal preſence.

THis from §. 19. I had to preſent concerning the ſecond Obſervable in this *Declaration*; the reaſon given there, *Why the Natural Body of Chriſt is not in the Euchariſt.* I now proceed to the third Obſervable, where it is declared, *That no Adoration is intended, or ought, to be done unto any Corporal preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood.* §. 39.

1. Where Firſt, as I think, that all grant a kneeling and adoration both of ſoul and body due to God the Father and Son, *for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt, given in this ſacred Solemnity to all worthy receivers*, as the *Declaration* hath it: ſo I ſuppoſe the preſent Clergy will grant, that if there were a Corporal preſence of Chriſt's natural Body in this Holy Sacrament, then Kneeling and Adoration would be here due alſo upon ſuch an account.

2. Tho' the *Corporal* preſence of Chriſt's Body, *i. e.* of its being there *ad modum Corporis*, or cloathed with the ordinary properties of a body, be denied; as it is not only by the *Engliſh* Divines, but by the *Lutheran* and *Roman* (ſee below §. 48.) yet let there be any other manner of Preſence (known from divine Revelation) of the very ſame body and blood, and this is as real and eſſential (let it be called *Spiritual, Myſtical*, or by what name you pleaſe) as if corporal; and then I do not ſee, but that Adoration will be no leſs due to it, *thus*, than *ſo*, preſent. §. 40.

3. And thirdly to ſhew that the *Church* of *England* hath heretofore believed and affirmed ſuch a Preſence to *which* they thought Adoration due; I muſt (here alſo) ſet before you what I have met with in ſuch writers of hers, as are of no mean account. §. 41.

Of this then firſt thus Biſhop *Andrews* in anſwer to *Bellarmine*; where, the Cardinal collecting from K. *James*'s alledging the Adoration of the Sacrament in the Church of *Rome* for a Novelty, that the King diſallowed *adorationem Chriſti Domini in Sacramento miro, ſed vero modo præſentis*, the learned Biſhop (*Reſp. ad Apol.* 8. *c. p.* 195.) goes on thus, *Apage vero, Quis ei hoc dederit?* Sacramenti, id eſt, Chriſti in Sacramento. *Imo Chriſtus ipſe Sacramenti res, in, & cum Sacramento, extra & ſine Sacramento, ubi ubi eſt, adora-* §. 42.

randus eſt : Rex autem Chriſtum in Euchariſtia vere præſentem, vere & adorandum ſtatuit ; rem ſcilicet Sacramenti, at non Sacramentum ; terrenam *ſcilicet partem, ut* Iræneus ; viſibilem, *ut* Auguſtinus. [Which Father the Biſhop had quoted a little before, ſaying, Sacrificium Euchariſtiæ duobus confici, viſibili elementorum ſpecie, & inviſibili Chriſti carne & ſanguine ; ſicut Chriſti perſona conſtat ex Deo & homine, cum ipſe verus ſit Deus, & verus homo.] *Nos vero & in myſteriis carnem Chriſti adoramus, cum* Ambroſio ; *& non* id, *ſed* eum *qui ſuper altare colitur. Male enim,* quid *ibi colatur, quærit Cardinalis, cum* quis, *debuit ; cum* Nazianzenus eum *dicat, non* id. *Nec carnem manducamus, quin adoremus prius, cum* Auguſtino : *& Sacramentum tamen nulli adoramus.*

§. 43. Again, thus Dr. *Taylor* in anſwer to that ſaying of *Ambroſe,* [Adorate ſcabellum, *&c.* per ſcabellum, terra intelligitur, per terram caro Chriſti, quam hodie quoque in myſteriis, (*i. e. the* Euchariſt *or* Symbols) adoramus ; & quam Apoſtoli in Domino Jeſu adorarunt.] *We worſhip,* &c. (ſaith the Doctor) *for we receive the myſteries, as repreſenting and exhibiting to our ſouls the fleſh and blood of Chriſt ; ſo that we worſhip* [he means the body or the fleſh of Chriſt] *in the ſumption and venerable uſages of the ſigns of his body, but we give no divine honour to the ſigns.*

§. 44. Again thus Biſhop *Forbes,* quoted before, *de Euchar. 2. l. 2. c. 9. §. ——An Chriſtus in Euchariſtia ſit adorandus,* Proteſtantes *ſaniores non dubitant. In ſumptione enim Euchariſtiæ (ut utar verbis Archiepiſcopi* Spalatenſis) *adorandus eſt Chriſtus vera latria ; ſiquidem corpus ejus vivum & glorioſum miraculo quodam ineffabili digne ſumenti præſens adeſt : & hæc adoratio non pani, non vino, non ſumptioni, non comeſtioni ; ſed ipſi corpori Chriſti immediate, per ſumptionem Euchariſtiæ exhibita, debetur & perficitur.*

§. 45. Thus alſo the Archbiſhop of *Spalato, 7. l. 11. c. 7. §. ——Si ſecundum veritatem qui digne ſumit Sacramenta corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, ille vere & realiter corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti, in ſe corporaliter, modo tamen quodam ſpirituali, miraculoſo, & imperceptibili, ſumit ; omnis digne communicans adorare poteſt & debet corpus Chriſti quod recipit : non quod lateat corporaliter* in *pane, aut* ſub *pane, aut ſub ſpeciebus & accidentibus panis ; ſed quod quando digne ſumitur panis ſacramentalis, tunc etiam ſumitur cum pane Chriſti corpus reale illi communioni realiter præſens.*

§. 46. And laſtly, thus Mr. *Thorndyke* argues for it, *Epil. 3. l. 30. c. p. 350. ——I ſuppoſe* (ſaith he) *that the body and blood of Chriſt may be adored whereſoever they are, and muſt be adored by a good Chriſtian, where the cuſtom of the Church, which a Chriſtian is obliged to*

commu-

communicate with, requires it. ——*This honour* [i. e. of worſhipping the body and blood of Chriſt] *being the duty of an affirmative precept, (which according to the received rule, ties always, tho' it cannot tye a Man to do the duty always; becauſe he then ſhould do nothing elſe:) what remains but a juſt occaſion to make it requiſite, and preſently to take hold and oblige? And is not the preſence thereof in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt a juſt occaſion preſently to expreſs, by that bodily act of Adoration, that inward honour, which we always carry towards our Lord Chriſt as God?*

Now notwithſtanding this, whereas the late *Declaration* firſt §. 47.
ſaith, That *adoration ought not to be done to any corporal preſence of our Lord's natural Body*, as in the Euchariſt; and 2*ly*, That upon this reaſon, *becauſe the natural Body of our Lord is not in the Euchariſt*; and 3*ly*, That again upon this reaſon, *becauſe this Body being in Heaven cannot alſo be in the Euchariſt*; i. e. in more places than one at the ſame time: therefore it ſeems clearly to deny Adoration due to Chriſt's Body as any way preſent in the Euchariſt; contrary to the fore-cited Doctrine, and contrary to the Religion of King *James* and Biſhop *Andrews* publiſhed to the world abroad. Or at leaſt, in thus denying adoration due to a corporal preſence, and then not declaring any other preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament that is adorable, when as ſuch a preſence they believe: it ſeems to betray the communicants to a greater miſcarriage in their behaviour, as to ſuch our Saviour's preſence at the receiving of theſe dreadful Myſteries; and to abridg this duty of that extent in which it had formerly been recommended by this Church. This briefly on the third Obſervable.

CHAP. V.

Some Replies to the former Diſcourſe.

TO conclude. Some Replies I can imagine to this former Diſcourſe. Such as theſe. 1. To the firſt Obſervable aboveſaid, §. 48.
§. 4. *viz. That the natural Body of our Lord is not in the Euchariſt*, that the meaning is, not, that *it* is not there in its eſſence, or ſubſtance at all; but only that the natural body, *&c. is not there modo naturali*, or *ad modum corporis naturalis*, not there after a natural manner. And if the *Declaration* means only this, (for which ſee Dr. *Taylor* before §. 15. and in the following Diſcourſe concerning the Euchariſt §. 6.) I grant it a truth; but find all other parties, the

The Firſt Limitation; The Natural Body of our Lord not in the Euchariſt modo naturali.

Lutherans, Calviniſts, the *Roman* as well as the *Engliſh* Church, agreeing in it. [For, for the *Roman* thus ſpeaks the Council of *Trent,* Seſſ. 13. 1. c. ——*Neque enim hæc inter ſe pugnant, juxta modum exiſtendi naturalem Salvatorem noſtrum in cœlis aſſidere ad dextram Patris, & nobis ſubſtantia ſua adeſſe præſentem Sacramentaliter, ea exiſtendi ratione; quam, etſi verbis exprimere vix poſſumus, poſſibilem tamen eſſe Deo cogitatione per fidem illuſtrata aſſequi poſſumus,* &c. Thus *Bellarmine* de Euchar. 1 l. 2. c. ---3, 5. c. 10. c. and elſewhere in that Treatiſe. ——*Chriſtum non eſſe in Euchariſtia ut in loco, vel ut in vaſe, aut ſub aliquo velo, ſed eo modo ut panis prius; ſed non ita, ut accidentia panis inhæreant Chriſti ſubſtantiæ; non coexiſtere aut commenſurari loco; non eſſe, ita ut habeat ordinem ullum ad corpora circumſtantia; non eſſe ſenſibile, viſibile, tangibile, extenſum; non adeſſe mobiliter, extenſive, corporaliter,* [as we underſtand this word to exclude not *naturam,* but *modum corporis.*]

And thus Dr. *Holden,* p. 316. ——*Verum & reale corpus Chriſti profitemur eſſe in hoc Sacramento; non more corporeo & paſſibili, ſed* ſpirituali *& inviſibili, nobis omnino incognito. Spirituali,* i. e. as oppoſed to *corporali,* but by no means as oppoſed to *reali.* And as for the *Lutheran* I find this in the pacifick Diſcourſes of Biſhop *Morton,* Biſhop *Hall,* and Biſhop *Davenant* (ſee the 11*th.* Chapter of his *adhort. ad pacem Eccleſiæ)* ſufficiently taken notice of, and urged for leſſening the difference between the ſeveral parties of the Reformed. ——*Chriſtum adeſſe ſignis,* but *inviſibiliter, intangibiliter, ſpiritualiter, ineffabiliter, ſacramentaliter, modo ſupernaturali, rationi humanæ incomprehenſibili, cœleſti, Deo ſoli noto.* ——Again, (about oral manducation in this his preſence with the ſigns) ——*Recipi quidem ore, ſed participari modo divino, admirabili, inſcrutabili; non atteri dentibus, non dividi, partiri, frangi: per* ſubſtantialiter, corporaliter, oraliter, *nihil aliud ſignificari niſi veram manducationem; non phyſicum, non eſſe cibum corruptibilem, ſed ſpiritualem; manducari a fidelibus, non ad corpus nutriendum,* [i. e. materially,] *ſed ad animam ſuſtentandam,* &c. Therefore do they, as others, deteſt the *Capernaitan* error.

To theſe I may add what Biſhop *Forbes* ſaith, *de Euchar. l.* 1. *c.* 1. 28. §. ——*Nemo ſanæ mentis Chriſtum de cœlo, vel de dextra Patris deſcendere viſibiliter aut inviſibiliter, ut in cœna vel ſignis localiter,* (i. e. *per modum corporis*) *adſit, exiſtimat. Fideles omnes unanimi conſenſu, & uno ore profitentur, ſe firmiter retinere articulos fidei* [aſcendit in cœlos, ſedet ad dextram Patris:] *& modum hujus præſentiæ credere ſe non eſſe naturalem, corporalem, carnalem, localem, per ſe,* &c. *ſed abſque ulla cœlorum deſertione, ſed ſupernaturalem,* &c.

But

But then, beſides that the Propoſition, carrying ſuch a meaning, had need to be altered in the expreſſion (theſe two being very different, *the natural body is not here*, and *the natural body is here, but not after a natural mode:*) the Reaſon which follows, and is given to confirm it, hindreth me from thinking, that the preſent Clergy ſo underſtands it, *viz.* this Reaſon giveth, That Chriſt's natural Body is not there, *becauſe it is againſt the truth of Chriſt natural Body to be* (which ſeems all one as if it ſaid, Chriſt's natural Body cannot be) *at one time in more places than one.* But if they hold the natural Body to be there, as well as in Heaven; this its being there (tho' there *modo non naturali*) overthrows this Reaſon, by its being ſtill in two places, the ſame time, in one, *modo naturali*; in the other, *modo non naturali.* §. 49.

To the 2d. Obſervable, *the Reaſon given.* It may be ſaid alſo, That it is againſt the truth of Chriſt's natural Body to be *modo naturali*, or *ad modum corporis naturalis*, in more places than one at once; but yet that, *modo non naturali*, it might by the divine power be rendred in divers places at once: and therefore that this natural Body (*abſolutely* ſpeaking) is not denied to be alſo in the Euchariſt, and not only in Heaven. §. 50. *The 2d. Limitation; A natural Body not in many places at once* modo naturali.

1. But here alſo firſt, I do not ſee any truth in ſuch a gloſs, for that which hath been ſaid before, §. 27. For if (it not implying a true contradiction) God by his divine power can make the *eſſence* or ſubſtance of a Body to be in more places or *ubi's* than one at once; he can make all the ſame *properties* or qualities thereof to be ſo too. For I ſee not how there can be more difficulty or contradiction, to make one and the ſame quantity or quality to be in two places at once, than to make one and the ſame natural ſubſtance; nor why more, to make the ſame natural ſubſtance of a *body* to be *circumſcr*[redacted]two places, than the ſame Angel *definitive*; both of theſe being finite, and having certain limits of their eſſence, out of which there eſſence naturally is not. §. 51.

2. Admitting this Gloſs for true, as alſo that made upon the firſt Obſervable, §. 48. yet I ſee not how theſe two aſſertions in the *Declaration* (§. 45.) if they be thus underſtood, can afford any foundation for the 3d. aſſertion for which they are urged, *viz. That no Adoration is due to Chriſt's natural Body as being in the Euchariſt:* which natural Body being granted by theſe gloſſes to be there, tho' not after a natural manner, yet can be no leſs, for this, an object of Adoration. §. 52.

§. 53. *The Third Limitation; Adoration not denied to Ch. Body as really and eſſentially, but only as* corporally preſent.

3. To the 3d. Obſervable concerning *Adoration*, it may be ſaid; That *Adoration to Chriſt's Body, as really and eſſentially preſent in the Euchariſt, is not denied*; but only as to any *corporal preſence* of it there, (which ſeems alſo to be the cauſe, that the Revivers of this *Rubrick* changed here the words of the former) [No Adoration ought to be done to the *real and eſſential*] into [No Adoration ought to be done to the *corporal preſence.*]

§. 54. 1. Yet methinks here alſo firſt, they ſhould have more clearly expreſſed this, to prevent ſuch a miſapprehenſion. 2. Adoration being granted due in one way, as not due in another; and Chriſt's natural Body being granted preſent one way, as not preſent in another: methinks the former ſhould have been expreſſed as much or more, than the latter; and the whole frame of the *Declaration* have been changed thus, according to the true meaning of thoſe who received it; *viz. That Adoration is intended and ought to be done, tho' not to the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, becauſe the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored; yet ought to be done to the real and eſſential preſence of Chriſt's natural Fleſh and Blood: becauſe the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Chriſt are not only in Heaven, but alſo truly in the Euchariſt; it being not againſt the truth of Chriſt's natural Body, (if not after a* natural *manner, yet) in its true reality and eſſence, after ſome other manner effected ſupernaturally by divine power, to be at one time in more places than one.*

§. 55. Laſtly, in oppoſition to the *Proteſtant* Teſtimonies here produced, perhaps ſome other may be collected out of the ſame Authors that ſeem to qualifie theſe here ſet down, and better to ſuit with the expreſſions of this *Declaration.* But neither will this afford any relief. For to free them from a real contradiction, the ſenſe of the others reduced to thoſe here cited will leave all things in the ſame ſtate; or elſe the ſenſe of theſe accommodated to others will appear to abett no more than bare *Zuinglianiſm*, [i. e. *an abſolute non-preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, ſave only in its vertue, and effects, and the preſence of his Spirit*, &c.] and to oppoſe and deſtroy the general Tradition and Doctrine of the Fathers.

FINIS.

THE

CATHOLICKS DEFENCE,

FOR THEIR

ADORATION

OF THE

Body and Blood

OF OUR

LORD,

As believed Really and Subſtantially preſent

IN THE

Holy SACRAMENT

OF THE

EUCHARIST.

At *OXFORD* Printed, *Anno* 1687.

THESES of Adoration of the *EUCHARIST.*

CONTENTS.

1. PRoteſtant-*Conceſſions.* §. 1.

2. Catholick-*Aſſertions.* §. 1.

Preſuppoſitions. §. 1.

1. *Of a Precept of giving Divine Worſhip to our Lord.* §. 1.

2. *Of our Lord's whole Perſon its being where his Body is.* §. 2.

3. *Of this Divine Perſon being ſupremely adorable wherever his Body is: Granted by* Proteſtants. §. 3.
Not only in Virtue, but Subſtance. §. 5.

4. *That this Preſence of our Lord's Body and Blood is by Proteſtants affirmed in the Euchariſt; and that this Body is then to be worſhipped with ſupreme Adoration.* §. 5.

5. *Further affirmed; That Chriſt's Body and Blood are preſent not only to the worthy Communicant, but to the Symbols; and whilſt preſent are to be adored.* §. 7.

6. *Granted by* Daille, *That tho' he and his believe not Chriſt's Body preſent in the ſigns, yet they, for this, break not Communion with thoſe that hold it.* §. 8.

Catholick-

Contents.

Catholick *Assertions.*

1. *A Sign or Symbol to remain after Consecration distinct from the thing signified.* §. 9.
This external Sign to be all, that which is perceptible by the senses, of the Bread and Wine; tho' not their Substance. §. 10.

2. *The word* Sacrament *to be taken not always in the same sense, but sometimes for the Sign or Symbol; sometimes for the thing signified.* §. 11.

3. *Catholicks ground Adoration, not on Transubstantiation, (which, as also Consubstantiation, involves it) but on Real Presence with the Symbols: maintaining Adoration due, tho' Christ's Body were present, neither under the Accidents of Bread (as* Catholicks *say); nor under the Substance of Bread (as* Lutherans *say); but after some other unknown manner distinct from both.* §. 17.

4. *Supposing (not granting) Transubstantiation an error, yet if Corporal or Real Presence held by the Lutherans be true, Catholicks plead their Adoration warrantable.* §. 18.

5. *Supposing Real Presence an Error, and the* Lutheran *and* Roman *Church both mistaken; yet these latter, in such Adoration, as excusable from Idolatry, as the other.* §. 19.

6. *Supposing both the former Opinions Errors, and (indeed) no Presence of Christ's Body with the Symbols at all; yet such Adoration by the one, or the other of Christ (who is a true object of supreme Adoration, and only mistaken by them to be where he is not) cannot be termed such Idolatry, as is the professed worshipping of an Object not at all adorable.* §. 21.

7. *Whatever Idolatry it is called in a Manichean worshipping Christ in the Sun, or in an Israelite worshipping God in the Calves at* Dan *and* Bethel, *because adoring a fancy of their own, (and a good intention grounded on a culpable ignorance excuseth none from Idolatry;) yet since* Daille, *and perhaps others, allows a reasonable (tho' mistaken) ground of Adoration sufficient for avoiding the just imputation of Idolatry;*

hence

hence if Catholicks can produce a rational ground of their apprehending Christ present in the Eucharist, tho' possibly mistaken in it, they are to be excused from Idolatry, on the same terms. §. 22.

Catholicks *Grounds for their Belief.*

1. *Divine Revelation.* §. 24.
2. *The Declaration thereof by the supremest Church-Authority in Councils.* §. 25.
3. *The Testimony of Primitive Times.* §. 26.
4. *The Universal Doctrine and Practice of the later, both Eastern and Western Churches.* §. 27.
5. Protestant *Concessions.* §. 28.

8. *For these Grounds given by* Catholicks, *Idolatry by many* Protestants *of late but faintly charged upon the Church of* Rome. §. 30.

9. Catholicks *grant, That to adore what is believed to be Bread, or perform the external signs of Adoration to our Lord as present there, where the Worshipper believes he is not, is unlawful to be done by any whilst so perswaded.* §. 33.

CATHOLICK Theſes,

Concerning the

ADORATION of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*

IN THE

EUCHARIST.

CONcerning the Adoration of Chriſt's Body and Blood, and ſo of his Divine Perſon, as preſent in the Euchariſt, 1. I ſhall ſhew, *what in reaſon is or muſt be conceded by Proteſtants.* 2. Examine *what Catholicks maintain.* §. 1.

1. I ſuppoſe a general precept of giving *ſupreme and divine adoration to our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt:* And, that as Affirmative precepts (ſuch as this is) do not oblige to every time, and place; ſo, if they are unlimited and general, they warrant the lawfulneſs of our practice of them in any time or place; nor is there any need of any particular divine command in reſpect of theſe (i. e. *places* and *times,*) without which command we may not obey them. [For, what abſurdities would follow hence? For, Was our Saviour, when on Earth, never lawfully worſhipped, but in place, or time, firſt commanded? Nor then, when he ſhewed and preſented himſelf to them for ſome other purpoſe, than for adoration? as to teach them, to ſuffer for them, *&c.* Might not the *Magi* worſhip him lying in the Cratch, diveſted of all appearance of Majeſty, without a ſpecial command from God?] But it is ſufficient to warrant our practice of them; if, in reſpect of ſuch time, and place, there be no expreſs prohibition. *Suppoſitions.*

2. I ſuppoſe; that, *where-ever the Body of our Lord is, there is his whole perſon*; it being no more ſince his Reſurrection to be a dead body, (for *Chriſt dieth no more,* Rom. 6. 9.); but having the Soul joyned with it: as likewiſe, ever ſince the Incarnation, having alſo its *hypoſtaſis* or ſubſiſtence from the Divinity joyned with it; even when it was in the Grave, and the Soul ſevered from it. §. 2.

§. 3. 3. I ſuppoſe, it is a thing granted alſo by learned Proteſtants, That, *where ever this Body of our Lord is preſent, there this Divine Perſon is ſupremely adorable:* As the Divinity every where preſent is every where adorable, and may be ſo adored in the preſence or before any of his Creatures; if ſuch adoration be directed to *him*, not *it*, (as, when I ſee the Sun riſing, I may lawfully fall down on my knees, and bleſs the Omnipotent Creator of it; and ſee 1 *Cor.* 14. 24, 25.) *may be*, I ſay, but not, *muſt:* for where there is only ſuch a general preſence of the Divinity; as is in every *time*, *place*, and *thing*; here our Adoration may and muſt be diſpenſed with, as to ſome times, and places.

None likewiſe can deny, That the Humanity of our Lord alſo, in a notion abſtractive from the Divinity perſonally united to it, is truly adorable; tho' this with a worſhip not exceeding that due to a Creature.

§. 4. [For the lawfulneſs of Adoration, where ever is ſuch a preſence of the perſon of our Lord, ſee Biſhop *Andrews*, *Reſp. ad Apol. p.* 195. *Chriſtus ipſe Sacramenti res* [*ſive*] *in & cum Sacramento, ſive extra & ſine Sacramento, ubi-ubi eſt, adorandus eſt.*

Apol. des Eglis. Reform. c. 10. Thus alſo *Daillé*, *Apol. des Eglis. Reform. c.* 10. who, in pitching eſpecially on this point, *Adoration of the Euchariſt*, as hindring the Proteſtants longer ſtay in the Roman Communion, hath in this Diſcourſe, and in two Replies to *Chaumont* made afterward in defence of it, diſcuſſed it more particularly than many others) in anſwer to S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Auſtin* their adoring the fleſh of Chriſt in the Myſteries. ——*The Humanity of* Jeſus Chriſt (ſaith he) *perſonally united to the Divinity, is by conſequence truly and properly adorable.* And again: *They only adored* Jeſus Chriſt *in the Sacrament; which is the thing we agree to.* And *ibid. p.* 29. *We do willingly adore* Jeſus Chriſt, *who is preſent in the Sacrament, namely by Faith in the heart of the Communicants*, &c. And ſee Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Roman. Idol. c.* 2. *p.* 114. ——*The Queſtion* (ſaith he) *between us, is not whether the perſon of Chriſt is to be worſhipped with Divine worſhip, for that we freely acknowledge. And altho' the humane nature of Chriſt, of it ſelf, can yield us no ſufficient reaſon for adoration* [he muſt mean, Divine]: *yet being conſidered as united to the Divine Nature, that cannot hinder, the ſame Divine worſhip being given to his Perſon, which belongs to his Divine Nature; any more than the Robes of a Prince can take off from the honour due unto him.* Tho' how well that which he ſaith before, *ibid.* §. 2. (as it ſeems againſt worſhipping Chriſt ſuppoſed preſent in the Euchariſt, without a ſpecial command to do it) conſiſts

conſiſts with what he ſaith here, and with what follows, let him look to it.]

4. It is affirmed by many Proteſtants, eſpecially thoſe of the Church of *England*, that *this Body and Blood of our Lord is really preſent, not only in virtue, but in ſubſtance in the Euchariſt*, either with the Symbols immediately upon the Conſecration; or at leaſt ſo, as to be received in the Euchariſt, together with the Symbols, by every worthy Communicant: and that this Body and Blood of our Lord, which is not ſevered from his Perſon, is then to be worſhipped with ſupreme Adoration. §. 5. n. 1.

[See 1. for a *ſubſtantial* preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt, (I mean at leaſt to the worthy Receiver, contradiſtinct to a Preſence by *effect* only, Influence, Virtue, Grace, or the Holy Spirit, uniting us to Chriſt's Body in Heaven) Dr. *Taylor* of *Real Preſence*, p. 12. *When the word Real* (ſaith he) *is denied* [*i. e.* by Proteſtants, as it was in King *Edward*'s time] *the word* Real is *taken for* Natural, [*i. e.* as he explains it p. 5. including not only the nature of the Body, for that is the ſubſtance; but the corporal and natural manner of its exiſtence: he goes on,] *But the word* ſubſtantialiter *is alſo uſed by Proteſtants in this queſtion, which I ſuppoſe may be the ſame with that which is in the Article of* Trent; Sacramentaliter præſens Salvator ſubſtantia ſua nobis adeſt; *in* ſubſtance, *but after a Sacramental manner.* See the Confeſſion of *Beza*, and the *French* Proteſtants (related by *Hoſp. Hiſt. Sacram. part. ult.* p. 251.) *Fatemur in cœna Domini non modo omnia Chriſti beneficia, ſed ipſam etiam Filii hominis* ſubſtantiam, *ipſam, inquam, veram carnem & verum illum ſanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non ſignificari duntaxat, aut ſymbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi tanquam abſentis memoriam; ſed vere ac certo repræſentari, exhiberi, & applicanda offerri, adjunctis ſymbolis minime nudis, ſed quæ (quod ad Deum ipſum promittentem & offerentem attinet) ſemper rem ipſam vere ac certo* conjunctam *habeant; ſive fidelibus, ſive infidelibus protonantur.*

Again, *Beza* Epiſt 68. ſpeaking againſt *Alemannus*, and ſome others, who oppoſed a *ſubſtantial* preſence; *Volunt* (ſaith he) *ex*-Gallica *Confeſſione* [Art. 36.] *& Liturgia* [Catech. Din. 53.] *ex pungi* ſubſtantiæ *vocem, idcirco de induſtria paſſim a* Calvino *& a me uſurpatam, ut eorum calumniæ occurreremus, qui nos clamitant pro re Sacramenti non ipſum Chriſtum, ſed ejus duntaxat dona & energiam, ponere.* And *Epiſt.* 5. he argues thus againſt the ſame *Alemannus.* ——*Velim igitur te imprimis intueri Chriſti verba*; Hoc eſt corpus meum, quod pro vobis traditur, *&* Hic eſt ſanguis meus

us qui pro vobis funditur. ——*Age pro his vocibus* Corpus & Sanguis, *dicamus, Hoc eſt* efficacia *mortis meæ, quæ pro vobis traditur; Hic eſt* Spiritus *meus qui pro vobis effunditur: Quid ineptius eſt hac oratione? Nam certe verba illa,* Quod pro vobis traditur, & Qui pro vobis funditur, *neceſſario huc te adigunt, ut de ipſamet Corporis & Sanguinis* ſubſtantia *hoc intelligere cogaris.*

See *Hooker, Eccleſ. Pol.* 5. l. 67. §. p. 357. *Wherefore ſhould the world continue ſtill diſtracted and rent with ſo manifold contentions; when there remaineth now no Controverſy, ſaving only about the ſubject where Chriſt is? ——Nor doth any thing reſt doubtful in this, but whether, when the Sacrament is adminiſtred, Chriſt be whole within Man only; or elſe his Body and Blood be alſo externally ſeated in the very conſecrated Elements themſelves?* [But a great Controverſy ſurely there would be beſide this, if the one party held *Chriſt's* Body *ſubſtantially*, and the other *virtually* preſent.] Again, *p.* 360. ——*All three opinions do thus far accord in one,* &c. *That theſe holy myſteries, received in due manner, do inſtrumentally both make us partakers of that body, and blood, which were given for the life of the World; and beſides alſo impart unto us, even in true and real, tho' myſtical, manner, the very Perſon of our Lord himſelf, whole, perfect, and entire.*

Thus alſo Biſhop *Andrews*, Reſp. ad Apol. Bell. 1. cap. p. 11. *Nobis vobiſcum de Objecto convenit, de modo lis omnis eſt.* [But there would be a *lis* concerning the Object, if one affirmed the *ſubſtance* of the body there, the other only the *virtue*, or efficacy.]

§. 5. n. 2. See Biſhop *Coſins* his late *Hiſtoria Tranſubſtantiationis, tit. cap.* 2. *Proteſtantium omnium conſenſus de* reali, *id eſt, vera,* (*ſed non* carnali) *Præſentia Chriſti in* Euchariſtia *manifeſte conſtat.* And in proof of this *p.* 10. he quotes *Poinet* Biſhop of *Winchester*, his *Dialacticon de veritate, natura, atque ſubſtantia Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtia*; *Quod* (ſaith he) *non alio conſilio edidit, quam ut fidem & doctrinam Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ illuſtraret. Et primo oſtendit* Euchariſtiam non ſolum figuram *eſſe Corporis Domini*; *ſed etiam ipſam veritatem, naturam, atque ſubſtantiam in ſe comprehendere*; *idcirco nec has voces* Naturæ & Subſtantiæ *fugiendas eſſe*; *Veteres enim de hoc Sacramento diſſerentes ita locutos fuiſſe. Secundo quærit, an voces illæ,* Veritas, Natura, & Subſtantia, *communi more in hoc myſterio a veteribus intelligebantur*; *an peculiari & Sacramentis magis accommodata ratione? Neque enim obſervandum eſſe ſolum, quibus verbis olim Patres uſi ſunt, ſed quid iſtis ſignificare ac docere voluerint. Et licet diſcrimen ipſe cum Patribus agnoſcat, inter Corpus Chriſti* formam humani corporis naturalem habens, & *quod*

in

in Sacramento eſt Corpus myſticum; *maluit tamen diſcrimen illud* ad modum præſentiæ & exhibitionis, *quam ad* ipſam rem, *hoc eſt*, Corpus Chriſti verum *accommodari; cum certiſſimum ſit, non aliud Corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, niſi quod a Chriſto pro fidelium ſalute in mortem traditum fuit.* Thus he, juſtifying *Poinet*'s expreſſions ſpeaking in the language of the Fathers. *p.* 43. ——*Non dicimus* (ſaith he) *in hac ſacra Cœna nos tantum eſſe participes fructus mortis, & paſſionis Chriſti; ſed fundum ipſum cum fructibus, qui ab ipſo ad nos redeant, conjungimus; aſſerentes cum Apoſtolo,* 1 Cor. 10. 16. Panem quam frangimus eſſe κοινωνίαν Corporis Chriſti, & Poculum Sanguinis ejus communicationem; *imo in eadem illa ſubſtantia, quam accepit in utero Virginis, & quam ſurſum in cœlos invexit; in hoc tantum a Pontificiis diſſidentes, quod illi manducationem hanc & conjunctionem, corporaliter fieri credunt; nos non naturali aliqua ratione, aut modo corporali; ſed tamen tam vere, quam ſi naturaliter aut corporaliter Chriſto conjungeremur.* [Here I underſtand his *non modo corporali* not to exclude *Corpus Domini*, or *non ratione naturali* to excude *natura rei*, or the thing it ſelf; but only to ſignify, that the Body is preſent, not after a corporal manner, or with the dimenſions and other common qualities of a Body; which thing indeed Catholicks alſo affirm.]

He ſeems alſo to grant, this ſubſtantial Preſence to be with the Symbols, after Conſecration, on the Table, and before communicating. For *p.* 65. for this he quotes the *Conc. Nicæn. Sublata in altum mente per fidem conſideremus, proponi in ſacra illa menſa Agnum Dei tollentem peccata mundi.* And p. 43. ——*Quoniam* (ſaith he) *res ſignificata nobis offertur & exhibetur tam vere quam ſigna ipſa: ea ratione ſignorum cum Corpore & Sanguine Domini conjunctionem agnoſcimus; & mutata eſſe elementa dicimus in uſum alium ab eo quem prius habuerunt.* [*i. e.* to be now conjoyned with, and to exhibit to us this Body of our Lord: which conjunction, he ſaith *p.* 45. is made *per omnipotentiam Dei.*] So he ſaith *ibid.* ——*Non quæritur, An Corpus Chriſti a Sacramento ſuo, juxta mandatum ejus inſtituto ac uſurpato, abſit; quod nos Proteſtantes & Reformati nequaquam dicimus aut credimus. Nam cum ibi detur & ſumatur, omnino oportet ut adſit; licet Sacramento ſuo quaſi contectum ſit, & ibi, ut in ſe eſt, conſpici nequeat.* And p. 125. ——*Fieri enim* (ſaith he) *de Elemento Sacramentum* [which ſurely is done in the Conſecration] *nec conſiſtere Sacramentum ſine Re Sacramenti, firmiter tenent.* And this *conjunctio Corporis Chriſti*, p. 35. he affirms to be made in receiving the Sacrament, not only *cum anima, ſed etiam cum corpore noſtro.* §. 5. n. 3.

Laſtly,

§. 5. n. 4. Laſtly, the *modus* of this true Preſence of the Body of our Lord with the Signs or Symbols in the Sacrament, when as it remains in Heaven till our Lord's ſecond coming, he makes, as others, to be *ineffabilis, imperſcrutabilis, non ratione inquirendus aut indagandus.* p. 36. ——*Nos vero hunc modum* [præſentiæ Chriſti in Euchariſtia] *fatemur cum Patribus eſſe ineffabilem, atque imperſcrutabilem, hoc eſt, non ratione inquirendum, aut indagandum; ſed ſola fide credendum. Etſi enim videtur incredibile in tanta locorum diſtantia penetrare ad nos* Chriſti *carnem, ut nobis ſit in cibum; meminiſſe tamen oportet, quantum ſupra ſenſus noſtros emineat Spiritus Sancti virtus, & quam ſtultum ſit ejus immenſitatem modo noſtro metiri velle. Quod ergo mens noſtra non comprehendit, concipiat fides.* [The like to which *eſſe ineffabilem, & ſupra ſenſus,* Catholicks ſay of the ſame preſence of our Lord in the Euchariſt *in tanta locorum diſtantia*, whilſt alſo at the very ſame time it is in Heaven.] And thus *Lanfrank* long ago in his anſwer to *Berengarius*, (who contended that *Chriſti Corpus cælo devocari non poterit,*) quoting the words of St. *Andrew* a little before his Paſſion: ——*Cum vero in terris carnes ejus ſunt comeſtæ, & vere ſanguis ejus ſit bibitus; ipſe tamen uſque in tempora reſtitutionis omnium in cæleſtibus ad dextram Patris integer ſemper perſeverat & vivat. Si quæris* (ſaith he) *modum quo id fieri poſſit; breviter ad præſens reſpondeo, Myſterium eſt fidei: credi ſalubriter poteſt, veſtigari utiliter non poteſt.* See alſo the *Gallican* Confeſſion, produced by this Biſhop, *p.* 23. where they ſay, *Chriſtus in cælis manſurus donec veniat*; and yet *nutriens & vivificans nos Corporis & Sanguinis ſui ſubſtantia,* [*i. e.* in the Sacrament:] that *Hoc myſterium noſtræ cum Chriſto coalitionis tam ſublime eſt, ut omnes noſtros ſenſus, totumque adeo ordinem naturæ ſuperat.* In all theſe then doth not the incomprehenſibility and ſupernaturality of this Myſtery lie in this, that the one Body of our Lord ſhould be at once in two places, *viz.* preſent at the ſame time in Heaven, and to us here in the Sacrament? And yet this Biſhop ſeems to find ſome trouble in it, to make any other unexplicable or unintelligible myſtery in the *Catholicks* Tranſubſtantiation, ſave only this. See *p.* 122. For the ceaſing of the ſubſtance of the Elements by God's Omnipotency he allows very feiſible; and then the Adduction of Chriſt's Body (pre-exiſtent) in the place of their ſubſtance, labours under no other difficulty, ſave this, this Body its being at once in two places, here and in Heaven: nor, having twice * mentioned ſuch a Sacramental Preſence of our Lord, hath he replied any thing againſt it, but that thus the term of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not rightly

*p. 122. & p. 125.

rightly applied to ſuch an Adduction; which is a *Logomachy*. But this ſeems the difficulty and incomprehenſibility that *Proteſtants* alſo confeſs in their Sacramental Preſence of our Lord *in tanta locorum diſtantia paſcentis nos in Euchariſtia vera Corporis ſui præſentia & ſubſtantia.*

Laſtly, after this Biſhop, with others, hath ſo far conformed to the Expreſſions and Language of the Fathers, as to allow an Eſſential or Subſtantial preſence of Chriſt's Body, it ſeems he finds ſome of theſe Expreſſions alſo ſo far to advance toward a Subſtantial tranſmutation of the Elements, as that he ſaith, *p.* 113. ——*Non abnuimus, nonnulla apud* Chryſoſtomum *alioſque Patres inveniri, quæ emphatice, immo vero Hyperbolice de Euchariſtia prolata ſunt: Et quæ, niſi dextre capiantur, incautos homines facile in errores abducent.* And below: *Sanctiſſimi Patres quo hæc auditorum animis vehementius & efficacius imprimerent, de Typis, tanquam ſi eſſent ipſa Antitypa, Oratorum more multa enunciant.* And again, *p.* 117. *Si verba* [i. e. of ſome of the Fathers] *nimis rigide urgeantur abſque intellectu Sacramentali; nihil aliud ex iis colligi poteſt, quam Panem & Vinum proprie & realiter ipſum Chriſti Corpus & Sanguinem eſſe; quod ne ipſi quidem Tranſubſtantiatores admittunt.* Where he granting the expreſſions of ſome of the Fathers ſo high as to tranſcend the Aſſertions of Catholicks, or Tranſubſtantiators; whoſe Aſſertions again tranſcend thoſe of Proteſtants in this Myſtery: it ſeems not reaſonable, that he ſhould after this depreſs and extenuate their meanings, to countenance and comply rather with that Opinion that is farther diſtant from their expreſſions. Neither will the ſame Fathers calling, in other places, the Elements *Symbols* and *Signs* of Chriſt's Body, (as he pleadeth *p.* 116.) afford him that relief he ſeeks for from it. For ſince the Catholicks, as well as Proteſtants, do firmly maintain and profeſs an external Symbol, as well as the thing ſignified in the Euchariſt, *viz.* all that is perceived by our ſenſes, and that is viſible, guſtable, or tangible, of the *Elements*; as the Proteſtants contend this Symbol to be not only theſe, but the very Subſtance and nature of the Elements alſo: here it will be found that theſe ſentences of the Fathers do ſuffer much leſs force and torture, if underſtood according to the *Symbol* ſuppoſed by Catholicks, than that by Proteſtants. For example, the Biſhop * hath mentioned that paſſage of the ancient Author *de Cœna Domini* in S. *Cyprian*'s Works: the words are theſe; ——*Panis iſte quem Dominus diſcipulis porrigebat, non effigie ſed natura mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus eſt caro: & ſicut in perſona Chriſti Humanitas ap-*

§. 5. n. 5

* p. 120.

parebat, & latebat Divinitas; ita Sacramento visibili ineffabiliter divina se effudit essentia. Here, I say, if the *Sacramentum visibile*, and the external Symbol be taken in this Bishops way, for *substantia* or *natura panis*, all is extremely forced, and confounded; and so he is driven to expound it, that by *mutatio naturæ panis* is meant only *mutatio usus* *; the change of which use of the Bread also seems no object of God's Omnipotence. But the Symbol or Sacrament being taken for such as the Catholicks make it, *viz.* for the external *Effigies* or Sensibles of the Bread, all is good sense and coherent, and nothing strained: and the *Omnipotentia Verbi* rightly applied to the *mutatio naturæ panis:* as God's Omnipotency may be observed in the Fathers to be frequently urged, not only in relation to the presence of our Lords Body and Blood there, but also to the transmutation of the Elements there, whilst the exteriors of them still remain. But now in the last place, supposing the *natura panis* to remain, which the Father saith is changed, yet so long as these Divines maintain according to the Doctrine of the Fathers a substantial presence of our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, and that with the Symbols (as he saith *p.* 45. *Sacramento suo quasi contectum)*; tho' they will not admit such a Symbol as the Catholicks, and a Transubstantiation of the Elements: yet they must (if complying with the Fathers) at least confess some kind of Consubstantiation or conjunction of the substances of Christ's Body and of the Elements in the Eucharist; to which opinion the sayings of the Fathers constrained *Luther*, as he often professeth. Mean while if it be asked, why such a Consubstantiation is declined by Catholicks? their answer is ready; *viz.* because the greatest *Councils* that have been held successively in the Church-Catholick, upon and since the agitation of this controversy, have frequently and constantly stated and delivered, That the Scriptures, as understood and expounded by the Fathers and Church-Tradition, declare a Transubstantiation; in the Judgments of which Councils Catholicks hold it their Duty to acquiesce. *This of a Substantial Presence asserted by Protestants.*

* p. 120.

§. 6. n. 1. 2. Next, for *Adoration* too of this Body, as there present either with the Symbols upon their Consecration, or at least to all worthy receivers, see the same Bishop *Andrews*, *ib. c.* 8. *p.* 195; where to what *Bellarmin* hath said, *Inter novitia & nupera dogmata ponit Adorationem Sacramenti Eucharistiæ*, i. e. *adorationem Christi Domini in Sacramento, miro, sed vero modo præsentis*, he answers thus: *Sacramenti ait, id est, Christi Domini in Sacramento. Rex autem Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem, vere & adorandum statuit,*

statuit, rem scil. Sacramenti; at non Sacramentum. And ——*Nos vero & in mysteriis carnem Christi adoramus, cum* Ambrosio; *& non* id [*i. e.* Sacramentum] *sed* eum, *qui super altare colitur,* [*i. e.* Christum rem Sacramenti.] And is not this *res Sacramenti* worshipped as upon the Altar too with the Symbols there?

Since him, Bishop *Bramhal* to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*, * asking, how the Protestants could profess to agree in all essentials of Religion with the Roman Church, which they held to be an idolatrous Church, *i. e.* in worshipping the Sacrament as their God? thus replies: *The Sacrament is to be adored, said the Council of* Trent: The Sacrament, *i. e. formally the Body and Blood of Christ, say some of your Authors,* [where he quotes *Bellarmin de Sacramento, 4. l. 29. c.*] *we say the same.* [So Cardinal *Bellarmin* and Bishop *Bramhal* are agreed about this Adoration of our Lord in the Eucharist.] The Sacrament, *i. e. the species of Bread and Wine, say others: that we deny, and esteem it to be idolatrous. Should we charge the whole Church with Idolatry for the Error of a party?* * Rep. to Chalced. 2. c. p. 57.

The same concession with the same distinction makes the French-Protestant Divine *Daille*, in his second Reply to *Chaumont*, p. 29. *There is a vast difference between* to adore the Sacrament, *and to adore* Jesus Christ *in the Sacrament, or in the Mysteries.* ——*The later of these we freely do, since we believe him God blessed for ever together with the Father.* And afterward, in answer to the Fathers: *They speak* (saith he) *of the Flesh of Jesus Christ in the Mysteries, (of which we do not contest the Adoration) and not of the Eucharist.* And again: *They only adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, which is the thing we agree to.* And in his Apology, *Ch--p--* he saith concerning the Body of Christ if in the Sacrament, *That it is evident, that one may, and that one ought to worship it; seeing that the Body of Christ is a subject adoreable.* And *Chap.* 10. he grants upon *Adorate scabellum,* ——*That the faithful cast down themselves before the Ark to adore the Lord there, where the Divine Service was particularly joyned to the place where the Ark was.* Dr. *Taylor* saith *, ——*Concerning the action of Adoration, it is a fit address in the day of Solemnity with a* sursum corda, *with our hearts lift up to Heaven, where Christ sits (we are sure) at the right hand of the Father. For,* nemo digne manducat, nisi prius adoraverit, *&c.* [which, rightly understood, means *illud quod manducat.*] Here the Doctor allows adoring in the the Sacrament Christ as in Heaven. But if Christ's Body (and so himself in a special manner) be substantially present in the Eucharist, here on Earth; why not adore him, not only as in Heaven, but as present here? See elsewhere, *Real* §. 6. n. 2. * Real Presence, §. 13. n. 5.

Pref. p. 144. where he saith, *We worship the flesh of Christ in the Mysteries exhibiting it to our Souls.*

§. 6. n. 3. See *Spalatensis de rep. Eccles.* l. 7. c. 11. §. 7. *&c.* ——*Si secundum veritatem qui digne sumit sacramenta corporis & sanguinis Christi, ille vere & realiter corpus & sanguinem Christi, in se corporaliter, modo tamen quodam spirituali, miraculoso, & imperceptibili, sumit; omnis digne communicans adorare potest & debet corpus Christi quod recipit.* [Is then the worthy Communicant to worship, but not the unworthy; because Christ's Body is there present to the one, but not to the other?] *Non quod lateat corporaliter in pane, aut sub pane, aut sub speciebus & accidentibus panis; sed quod quando digne sumitur panis sacramentalis, tunc etiam sumitur cum pane Christi corpus reale, illi communioni realiter præsens.* Thus *Spalatensis.*

And so Bishop *Forbes, de Euchar.* 2. l. 2. c. 9. §. ——*An Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus, Protestantes saniores non dubitant. In sumptione enim Eucharistiæ (ut utar verbis Archiepiscopi* Spalatensis*) adorandus est Christus vera latria, siquidem corpus ejus vivum, ac glorioſum, miraculo quodam ineffabili digne sumenti præsens adest; & hæc adoratio non pani, non vino, non sumptioni, non comestioni, sed ipsi Corpori immediate, per sumptionem Eucharistiæ exhibito, debetur, & perficitur.* [Thus then Protestants allow Adoration to Christ's Body and Blood, as substantially present in the Eucharist, if not to the Symbols, yet to the worthy receiver.]

§. 7. 5*ly*. Yet further; It is affirmed by another party of Protestants, the *Lutherans*, more expressly, that Christ's body and blood are *present*, not only to the worthy Communicant, but to the *consecrated Symbols*; and whilst so present, which is during the action of the Lord's Supper, (*i.e.* as I conceive them, from the Consecration till the end of the Communion) *are to be adored.*

[Of which thus *Chemnitius, Exam. Conc. Trid.* part. 2. sess. 13. c. 5. *Deum & Hominem in Divina & humana natura, in actione Cœnæ Dominicæ vere & substantialiter præsentem, in spiritu & veritate adorandum, nemo negat; nisi qui cum Sacramentariis vel negat, vel dubitat de præsentia Christi in cœna.* Ibid. ——*Et quidem humanam etiam ejus naturam, propter unionem cum Divinitate, esse adorandam, nemo nisi* Nestorianus *in dubium vocat.* ——*Ita* Jacob *Gen.* 28. Moses *Exod.* 34. Elias 3 *Reg.* 19. *non habebant sane peculiare mandatum, ut in illis locis Deum adorarent: sed quia habebant generale mandatum ut Deum ubique adorarent, & certi erant Deum sub externis & visibilibus illis symbolis vere adesse, & peculiari modo gratiæ se ibi patefacere; certe Deum ipsum, quem ibi presentem esse credebant, adorabant. Nec vero Deum illi procul in cælo Empyræo a se remotum*

&

& abſentem, ſed vere præſentem, & quidem peculiari modo gratiæ præſentem, adorarunt. ——Thus he. Nor do I know, that the *Calviniſts* have at any time accuſed their brethren the *Lutherans* of Idolatry in ſuch a practice. I find alſo Mr. *Thorndike* in the like manner clearly maintaining, 1. A preſence of Chriſt's Body with the ſymbols, immediately upon Conſecration: and, 2. An Adoration due to it. See the *former*, in *Epilog. l.* 3. *c.* 2. and, 3. where *p.* 17. *I have ſaid enough* (ſaith he) *to evidence the myſtical and ſpiritual preſence of the fleſh and blood of Chriſt in the Elements, as the Sacrament of the ſame, before any Man can ſuppoſe that ſpiritual preſence of them to the ſoul, which the eating and drinking Chriſt's fleſh and blood ſpiritually by living Faith importeth.* And ſee the *latter*, ib. c. 30. p. 350. —— *I ſuppoſe* (ſaith he) *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt may be adored where-ever they are; and muſt be adored by a good Chriſtian, where the cuſtom of the Church, which a Chriſtian is obliged to communicate with, requires it.* ----*This honour* [*i.e.* of worſhipping the Body and Blood of Chriſt] *being the duty of an affirmative precept, (which, according to the received rule, tyes always; tho' it cannot tye a Man to do the duty always, becauſe he then ſhould do nothing elſe:) what remains but a juſt occaſion to make it requiſite, and preſently to take hold and oblige? And is not the preſence thereof in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt a juſt* occaſion *preſently to expreſs by the bodily act of Adoration, that inward honour, which we always carry toward our Lord Chriſt as God?* ——Again p. 351. *Not to balk that freedom* (ſaith he) *which hath carried me to publiſh all this: I do believe that it was ſo practiſed and done* [*i.e.* our Lord Chriſt really worſhipped in the Euchariſt] *in the ancient Church, and in the ſymbols before receiving; which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Chriſt, obliging all to conform to it in all things within the power of it. I know the conſequence to be this, That there is no juſt cauſe why it ſhould not be done at preſent, but that cauſe which juſtifies the reforming of ſome part of the Church without the whole: which, were it taken away, that it* [this adoration] *might be done again, and ought not to be, of it ſelf alone, any cauſe of Diſtance* [*i.e.* between the Churches of Chriſt.]

6. It is granted by *Daille* in his *Apology*, c. 11. and in his defence of it againſt *Chaumont*, 1. That altho' the Reformed of his party, do not believe the preſence of Chriſt's body in the Signs, yet they *eſteem not the belief of it ſo criminal, that it obligeth them to break off communion with all thoſe that hold it.* So that, had the Roman Church no other error, ſave this, they freely confeſs, it had given them

them no ſufficient cauſe of ſeparating from it: *as* (ſaith he) *appears in this, that we tolerate and bear with it in the* Lutherans.

*Reply to *Chaumont*, p. 63.

And again, * for the adoration of this Body as ſo preſent with the ſigns, (when indeed it is not ſo,) he ſaith, ——*That it is only vain and unprofitable, and that, as one may ſay, falls to nothing; being deceived not in this, that it makes its addreſſes to an object not adorable; but in this only, that miſtaking it, it ſeeks it, and thinks to embrace it there where it is not.* And *c.* 12. he alſo freely confeſſeth, *That had the Church of* Rome *only obliged them to worſhip* Jeſus Chriſt *in the Sacrament, and not uſed this expreſſion, that the ſervice of* Latria *ought to be rendred to the Holy Sacrament:* * *ſhe had not obliged them by this to adore any Creature.* Thus he, as it were conſtrained thereto by the *Lutherans* Proteſtants Opinion and Practice, for his retaining their Communion, and freeing them from Idolatry. 2. It is granted alſo, *Apol.* c. 11. ——That when our Lord was on Earth, a Diſciple's giving divine honours, upon miſtake, to another perſon much reſembling him, would be no Idolatry. So, ſuppoſing the Conſecrated Hoſt were truly adorable, granted, that ſhould any one ſee one on the Altar, that hapned not to be Conſecrated, and Worſhip it, neither would ſuch a perſon be guilty of Idolatry. So he pronounces him blameleſs, that ſhould give the Honour and Service due to his true Prince to a Subject, whom, very like, he took for his Prince. Yet that a *Manichean* worſhipping the Sun, miſtaken to be the very ſubſtance of Chriſt, (ſee S. *Auſtin contra Farſtum* l. 12. c. 22. l. 20. c. 9.) for *Chriſt*; or (to repreſent the opinion more refined) worſhipping with divine honours not the Sun, but only Chriſt in the Sun, he could not in this be excuſed from Idolatry. And, that that which diſtinguiſhes theſe caſes, and renders them ſo different, is, not a good intention to worſhip only him that is truly God, or Chriſt; nor the opinion and belief Men have, that the Object they worſhip is truly ſuch; for this good intention (as he in that Chapter, and other Reformed Writers, and among others Dr. *Stillingfleet*, copiouſly preſs) is common to the worſt of Idolaters, as to the reſt: but the error or ignorance of the Judgment, from which flows this miſtaking practice; as that is perverſly *affected* and culpable, or *innocent* and excuſable. Of which thus he, *Ibid.* —— *I maintain, that ignorance excuſeth here when it is involuntary; when the ſubject* [I add, or the preſence of it] *we miſtake in, is ſo concealed, that whatever deſire we have, or pains we take, to find out the truth, it is not poſſible for us to diſcover it.* —— *But there, where the ignorance of the Object* [or of its preſence] *proceeds not from the ob-*

* Conc. *Trid.* ſeſſ. 13. 5.

ſcu-

ſcurity or difficulty of the thing, but from the malice or negligence of the perſon; this is ſo far from excuſing, that it aggravates our fault. Thus he excuſes one that ſhould have adored a perſon much reſembling our Lord, or an unconſecrated Hoſt, ——*becauſe no paſſion or negligence of his cauſed ſuch a miſtake:* ——*but not thoſe who worſhipped the Sun for* Chriſt, [*or* Chriſt in the Sun;] ——*becauſe* (ſaith he) *the ignorance of ſuch people is viſibly affected and voluntary, ariſing from their fault only, and not from the obſcurity of the things they are ignorant in.* Nor ſo *Roman* Catholicks in their worſhipping the Sacrament for Chriſt; *becauſe* (ſaith he) *the error proceeds entirely from their paſſion, and not any thing from abroad.* [Thus he, clearing ſuch actions from Idolatry, where the error of the judgment is no way perverſe, voluntary, and culpable.]

Having hitherto ſhewed you ſeveral Conceſſions of *Proteſtants*, and having urged none here from any of them, but ſuch as I think all will, or in reaſon ought, to admit; next I proceed to examine, what it is that in this matter *Catholicks* do maintain.

1. And firſt, *Catholicks* affirm in the Euchariſt, after the Conſecration, a *ſign* or ſymbol to remain ſtill diſtinct; and having a diverſe exiſtence from that of the *thing ſignified*, or from *Chriſt's Body* contained in, or under it. [See *Conc. Trident. ſeſſ.* 13. *c.* 3. *Hoc eſſe commune Euchariſtiæ cum aliis Sacramentis, ut ſit ſymbolum rei ſacræ, & viſibilis forma inviſibilis gratiæ.* By which *forma viſibilis* (as *Bellarmin* expounds it, *de Euchariſt.* 4. *l.* 6. *c.*) is meant the *ſpecies* of the Elements, not the Body of *Chriſt.* —— So *Bellarmin, Euchar.* 2. *l.* 15. *c. Etiam poſt conſecrationem ſpecies panis & vini ſunt ſigna corporis & ſanguinis* Chriſti *ibi revera exiſtentium.* —— And 3. *l.* 22. *c. Accidentia remanent; quia ſi etiam accidentia abeſſent, nullum eſſet in Euchariſtia ſignum ſenſibile; proinde nullum eſſet Sacramentum.* So *Eſtius* in 4. *ſent.* 1. *diſt.* 3. §. *Euchariſtia conſtat ex pane, tanquam materia quadam partim tranſeunte, partim remanente; tranſeunte quidem ſecundum ſubſtantiam; remanente vero ſecundum accidentia, in quibus tota ſubſtantiæ vis & operatio nihilominus perſeverat.* Hence they allow of that expreſſion of *Irenæus*, 4. *l.* 34. *c.* where he ſaith, —— *Euchariſtiam ex duabus rebus, terrena & cæleſti, compoſitam eſſe.* And of S. *Gregory*, *dial.* 4. *l.* 58. *c. In hoc myſterio ſummis imis ſociari: terrena cæleſtibus jungi: unum ex viſibilibus ac inviſibilibus fieri.*] So that tho' theſe ſymbols and Chriſt's Body may be ſaid to make *unum aggregatum*; yet, if this be only the *ſpecies* or accidents of the Bread and Wine that remains, theſe cannot be ſaid to have any inherence in this Body of Chriſt, (tho' it is true on the other ſide that, being ac- §. 9. *Aſſertions.*

cidents only, they cannot be said to make a distinct *suppositum* from it;) or, if a substance remain, this cannot be said to have any hypostatical union (or to make one *suppositum*) with our Lord's Divinity or Humanity, as our Lord's Humanity hath such an union with his Divinity. From which it is observed by Dr. *Taylor* (*Real Presence*, p. 336.) That therefore still there is the less reason for *Romanists* to give any Divine worship (as he saith they do) to the symbols. Far therefore are Catholicks from granting (what a late Author * pretends they do, but that which he alledgeth no way shews it) as great an hypostatical union between Christ and the Sacrament, as between the Divine and Humane Nature.

* Stillingfl. Rom. Idol. p. 128.

§. 10. This external sign or symbol they also affirm to be *all that* of the Bread and Wine that is *perceived* by any *sense*. And tho' after such Consecration the substance of the Bread and Wine is denied to remain yet is *substance* here taken in such a sense, as that neither the hardness nor softness, nor the frangibility, nor the savour, nor the odour, nor the nutritive virtue of the Bread, nor nothing visible, nor tangible, or otherwise perceptible by any sense, are involved in it. Of which signs also they predicate many things, which they will by no means allow to be properly said of, or at least to be received in, or effected by, or upon *Christ*'s Body, now immortal and utterly impassible. So *sapere*, *digeri*, *nutrire*, *confortare*, *corporaliter*; and again, *frangi dentibus*, *comburi*, *rodi a brutis*, *animalibus*, and whatever other things may be named (excepting only those attributes, which in general are necessary to indicate the presence of *Christ*'s Body to us with the *species* whilst *integræ*; as the local positions, *elevari*, *recondi*, *ore recipi*, &c.) they apply to these symbols that remain; not to *Christ*'s Body which is indivisibly there. ——*Christus vere in sacramento existens nullo modo lædi potest*; *non cadit in terram*, [id enim proprie cadit (*saith he*) quod corporaliter movetur; *so also*, anima non cadit,] *non teritur*, *non roditur*, *non putrescit*, *non crematur*: *illa enim* (saith *Bellarmin* *) *in speciebus istis recipiuntur*, *sed Christum non afficiunt*.

* De Eucharist. 3. l. 10. c.

§. 11. 2. Concerning Adoration of the Sacrament, they affirm the word *Sacrament*, *not to be taken always in the same sense*; but sometimes to be used to signify only the *external signs* or symbols; sometimes only the *res Sacramenti*, or the thing contained under them, which is the much more principal part thereof. And, as *Protestants* much press, so *Catholicks* willingly acknowledge, a great difference between these two, the worshipping of the *Sacrament*, as this word is taken for the symbols, and the worshipping of *Christ*'s *Body* in the

the Sacrament. Now as the word *Sacrament* is taken for the *Symbols*, they acknowledge a certain inferior cult and veneration due thereto, as to other holy things, the holy Chalices, the holy Gospels, the holy Cross, *&c. of which Veneration much hath been spoken in the Discourse of* Images, §. 42. *&c.* but they acknowledge no supreme or divine Adoration due to the Sacrament, as taken in this sense for the Symbols; but only to our Lord's Body and Blood, and so to our Lord himself as present in this Sacrament, or with these Symbols. [So that be these Symbols of what latitude you will, either larger, as the *Lutheran* believes; or straiter, as the *Catholicks* say they are; or be they not only these, but the substance of bread also under them, as *Catholicks* believe it is not: yet neither those *species*, nor this *substance*, have any divine Adoration given or acknowledged due to them at all; no more than this substance of bread, believed there by the *Lutherans*, yet hath from them any such Adoration given to it.]

[That Catholicks thus by Adoration of the Sacrament with *Latria* only understand that of the *res Sacramenti*, the Adoration of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, see *Conc. Trid. sess.* 13. *c.* 5. *Omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo Sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Neque enim ideo minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum; nam illum eundem Deum præsentem in eo adesse credimus, quem Pater æternus introducens in orbem terrarum dicit*, Et adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei: *quem Magi procidentes adoraverunt.* Where, tho' the Council useth the expression of exhibiting *latriæ cultum Sacramento*; yet that this *cultus latriæ* is not applied to the Sacrament, as it implies the Sign or Symbol, but only the thing signified, both the words joined to it, *qui vero Deo debetur*, (which signifies the Council maintains that to be God they gave this *cultus latriæ* to) and the explication annexed, *Nam illum eundem Deum*, &c. may sufficiently convince to any not obstinately opposite. Neither do those words interposed, —— *Neque enim ideo* [*Sacramentum*] *minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum*, any way cross such a sense, as a late Author * too confidently presseth, saying, —— *That by* Sacrament *here the Council must understand the Elements or Accidents as the immediate term of that divine worship, or else the latter words* [*i. e.* quod fuerit a Domino institutum ut sumatur] *signify nothing at all. For what* (saith he) *was that, which was instituted by the Lord as a Sacrament? was it not the external and visible Signs, or Elements? why do they urge,* That

§. 12.

* *Stillingfleet, Rom. Idol. c.* 2. §. 2. p. 117.

the Sacrament ought not the leſs to be adored, becauſe it was to be taken, *but to take of the common objection*, That we ought not to give divine worſhip to that which we eat? *And what can this have reſpect to, but the Elements*? Thus argues he. When as he might know, that the Fathers of *Trent*, who ſaid this, do hold, the chief thing inſtituted and exhibited in the Sacrament to be, not the Elements, but Chriſt's Body; and *ipſum corpus Domini* to be alſo orally both taken and eaten, (tho' not *modo naturali carnis* or *corporis*) as well as the Elements, according to our Lord's expreſs words, *Accipite, Manducate, Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, [i.e. *quod manducatis*:] and when-as he might know alſo, that the occaſion of adding this clauſe was in oppoſition to a party of *Luther*'s followers, who, granting Chriſt's Body preſent with the Symbols, and yet denying Adoration, ſaid for it, that our Lord's Body [not the *Symbol*] was preſent there, *non ut adoretur, ſed ut ſumatur*. And *Calvin* alſo ſaith ſome ſuch thing, *Inſtitut.* l. 4. c. 17. §. 35. urging, there was no ſuch mandate for Adoration, *i.e.* of Chriſt's Body, of which he was formerly ſpeaking; but that our Lord commanded only, *accipite, manducate, bibite*, ——*quo* (ſaith he) *accipi* [or *ſumi*, if you will] *Sacramentum, non adorari jubet*: meaning *Sacramentum* in relation to *Corpus Domini*; elſe he ſaid nothing to the purpoſe of his former Diſcourſe. And it may be conſider'd here alſo, that not only the Council of *Trent*, but no Schoolman at all (ſome of which are thought uncautious in their expreſſions about Adoration of Images, and conſequently of the holy Symbols in the Euchariſt; nor is any Catholick accountable for them) takes the boldneſs to give *cultus latriæ (qui vero Deo debetur*, as the Council ſaith here) to the Elements, without annexing ſome qualification of a *coadoratio, per accidens, improprie, ſicut veſtes Regis adorantur cum Rege*, or *ut Rex veſtitus adoratur*, yet without our mental notion at ſuch a time ſtripping him of his Garments. Therefore neither can the Council here be rationally preſumed to ſpeak of the Symbols, when it uſeth no ſuch qualifications.

§. 13. But, to put this matter out of all doubt, the Definition of this Council in the *6th. Canon* (more than which is not required to be profeſſed by any Son of the *Roman* Church) is this: ——*Si quis dixerit in ſancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento Chriſtum unigenitum Dei Filium non eſſe cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum*, ——*& ejus Adoratores eſſe Idololatras, Anathema ſit.* Concerning which, and ſome other paſſages in this Council, in comparing the *Chapters* with the *Canons*, *Franciſcus a ſancta Clara, Enchiridion of Faith Dial.* 3. §. 18. judiciouſly obſerves, ——*That altho' Catholick faith,*

as to the ſubſtance, is declared in the Chapters, (as indeed it is,) *yet according to this we are obliged only* ſub anathemate *to that form of expreſſion which is defined in the* Canons. 1. *Becauſe the* Chapters *are not framed in the ſtile of Conciliary Definitions, with* Anathema's, *and the like.* 2. *Becauſe the* Canons (where the very form is exceeding exact) *ſometimes differ from the manner of expreſſion in the* Chapters, *in order to the ſame matter: As* ſeſſ. 6. *of* Juſtification; Canon 11. *and* Chapter 7. *alſo* ſeſſ. 13. *of the* Sacrament of the Euchariſt; Canon 6. Chapter 5. *and elſewhere: yet* ſub anathemate *all muſt ſtand to the* Canons; *and therefore muſt expound the* Chapters *by them.* See more in the Author.

Soave alſo, *l.* 4. *p.* 343. in his cenſure of this 13*th.* Seſſion, tho' he ſaith magiſterially enough in oppoſition to a Council, ——*That the manner of ſpeech uſed in the* 5th. *point of Doctrine, ſaying,* That divine worſhip was due to the Sacrament, *was noted alſo for improper; ſince it is certain, that the thing ſignifyed or contained is not meant by the* Sacrament, *but the thing ſignifying or containing.* [But what Catholick will grant him this, that *Sacrament* includes not both; or, of the two, not more principally the thing contained in, or joined with the Symbols?] Yet he obſerves, ——*That it was well corrected in the 6th.* Canon, *which ſaid,* That the Son of God ought to be worſhipped in the Sacrament. See the ſame obſerved alſo by *Grotius* in *Apolog. Rivet Diſcuſſ.* p. 79. where alſo he notes *Bellarmin*'s forequoted paſſage: *That the Controverſy between* Catholicks *and* Lutherans *in their ſaying,* The Sacrament, or Chriſt in the Sacrament, was to be worſhipped, *was only* in modo loquendi: To which nothing is replied by *Rivet in Dialyſi Diſcuſſionis,* but the matter there, as alſo in his *Apologetic,* paſſed over in ſilence. Add to *Grotius* what Mr. *Thorndike* diſcourſeth in defence of the expreſſion of *worſhipping the Sacrament, Epilog.* 3. l. 30. c. p. 352. *I confeſs it is not* (*neceſſarily*) *the ſame thing to worſhip* Chriſt *in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, as to worſhip the* Sacrament *of the Euchariſt. Yet in that ſenſe, which reaſon of it ſelf juſtifies, it is. For the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, by reaſon of the nature thereof, is neither the viſible* ſpecies, *nor the inviſible Grace of Chriſt's body and blood; but the union of both by virtue of the promiſe; in regard whereof ---- both concur to that which we call the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ---- by the promiſe which the Inſtitution thereof containeth. If this be rightly underſtood,* then *to worſhip the* Sacrament *of the Euchariſt, is to worſhip Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.* Thus he.

This in vindication of the Council. And *Bellarmine* explains himſelf in the ſame manner as the Council, in his Apology to King §. 14.

James,

James, *Inter nupera dogmata ponit* [Rex] *adorationem Sacramenti Euchariſtiæ*, i. e. [as Catholicks underſtand and explain it] *adorationem Chriſti Domini miro, ſed vero, modo præſentis.* To which Biſhop *Andrews* replies: ——*Quis ei hoc dederit?* Sacramento *i. e.* Chriſti *in Sacramento. Imo Chriſtus ipſe Sacramenti res in Sacramento adorandus eſt. Rex autem Chriſtum in Euchariſtia vere præſentem, vere & adorandum ſtatuit.* [Thus far then the King, Biſhop, and Cardinal are agreed] Again, *de Euchariſtia* l. 4. c. 29. ——*Quicquid ſit de modo loquendi, ſtatus Quæſtionis non eſt, niſi,* An Chriſtus in Euchariſtia ſit adorandus cultu latriæ? And, as it were to avoid offence, when he comes to treat on this ſubject, *de Euchar.* 4. *l. c.* 29. he prefixeth the Title to it, not *De adoratione*, but *De veneratione hujus Sacramenti*: And in it ſaith that ——*Nullus Catholicus eſt qui doceat, Ipſa ſymbola externa per ſe & proprie eſſe* adoranda *cultu latriæ, ſed ſolum* veneranda *cultu quodam minore.*

Of this Doctrine of Catholicks Biſhop *Forbes* gives this teſtimony, *l.* 2. *c.* 2. 9. §. *In Euchariſtia mente diſcernendum eſſe Chriſtum a viſibili ſigno docent* Romanenſes; *& Chriſtum quidem adorandum eſſe non tamen Sacramentum: quia ſpecies illæ ſunt res creatæ*, &c. *neque ſatis eſt* [i. e. to give them divine worſhip] *quod Chriſtus ſub illis ſit: quia etiam Deus eſt in Anima tanquam in Templo ſuo; & tamen adoratur Deus, non Anima*; *ut ait* Suares 3. Tom. 79. quæſt. 8. art. diſp. 65. §. 1. And ſo *Spalatenſis* l. 7. c. 11. n. 7. *Nam neque noſtri* [i. e. Catholicks] *dicunt ſpecies panis & vini, hoc eſt, accidentia illa eſſe adoranda: ſed dicunt corpus Chriſti verum & reale, quod ſub illis ſpeciebus latet, debere adorari.* When then the *Roman* Church, ſpeaking of ſupreme Adoration, explains her language of *adoring the Sacrament*, to mean only adoring Chriſt's Body, and ſo Chriſt as preſent there; and not adoring any other thing whatever (ſubſtance, or accident) that is preſent there, or that is alſo included in the word *Sacrament*: that accuſation, which her uſing ſuch language of *adoring the Sacrament* can ſeemingly expoſe her to, is at the moſt, not of an *error*, but an improper expreſſion. But the propriety of language dutiful Sons ought to learn from, not teach, their Mother; who alſo ſpeaks that which hath deſcended to her from former times. Neither will it follow from Catholicks uſing the word *Sacrament* preciſely in this ſenſe, excluſively to any other matter ſave Chriſt's Body, that therefore one may uſe the word *Sacrament* promiſcuouſly for Chriſt's Body, in what reſpect ſoever we ſpeak of it; and, as well or as properly ſay, that the Sacrament, meaning Chriſt's

Body,

Body, is in the Heavens at God's right hand, or was on the Croſs, or the like. For tho' [*Sacrament*] thus applied involves no other ſubject or thing at all but Chriſt's Body; yet it *connotes*, beſides it, the place or manner of its preſence; ſignifying this Body only as preſent in the Myſteries; not as a term adequate to, and convertible with it, being in whatever time and place.

§. 15. I think theſe Teſtimonies produced both out of the Council of *Trent*, and other *Catholick* Authors, and alſo out of *Proteſtants* confeſſing ſo much of them, do ſhow ſufficiently the great extravagancy of thoſe *Proteſtant* Authors who tell their Readers, that the ſtate of this controverſy is not, Whether *Chriſt's Body*, and ſo Chriſt in the Sacrament be adorable with ſupreme Honours? but whether the *Sacrament*, and then by *Sacrament* are pleaſed to underſtand the *Symbols*? and then, to confute the Doctrine of *Rome*, argue, that no *Creature*, as the Symbols are, is capable of Divine Honour. *The ſtate of the Controverſy* (ſaith a late Writer of theirs *) *is, Whether proper Divine Worſhip in the time of receiving the Euchariſt may be given to the Elements on the account of a Corporal Preſence of Chriſt under them?* And againſt it he affirms, ——*That ſuppoſing the divine Nature preſent in any thing gives no ground upon that account to give the ſame worſhip to the thing wherein he is preſent, as I do to Chriſt himſelf.* So Biſhop *Andrews*, *Rex Chriſtum in Euchariſtia vere adorandum ſtatuit,* ——*at non Sacramentum, terrenam ſcilicet partem.* And ——*Nos in myſteriis carnem Chriſti adoramus, Sacramentum* [i. e. the Symbols] *nulli adoramus.* So Dr. *Taylor*, (Real Preſence p. 335.) *The Commandement to Worſhip God alone is ſo expreſs; the diſtance between God and Bread dedicated to the ſervice is ſo vaſt,* ——*that, if it had been intended that we ſhould have Worſhipped the H. Sacrament, the H. Scriptures would have called it God, or* Jeſus Chriſt. And *Diſſwaſive* §. 5. p. 76. he affirms the Church of *Rome* to give Divine Honour to the Symbols or Elements, and ſo to a Creature the due and incommunicable propriety of God. So they vainly alſo undertake to ſhew, that the Primitive Church did not terminate their Adoration upon the Elements; that the Fathers, when they ſpeak of worſhip, ſpeak of worſhipping the Fleſh of Chriſt in the Myſteries, or Symbols; not of worſhipping the Myſteries or Symbols. Theſe, I ſay, are great extravagances: whilſt the *Roman* Church owns or impoſes no ſuch Doctrine of Divine Adoration due to the Elements, and the true Controverſy on their ſide is only this; 1. Whether the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*, preſcinding from whatever Symbol is or

* Stillingfleet Rom. Idol p. 117.

may

may be there, is *adoreable*, as being present in the Sacrament with these symbols? (This is affirmed by *Catholicks*: more than this needs not be so;) And, 2. Whether the *Adoration of Christ's Body*, and so of Christ as present, if it should not be so, *will amount to Idolatry?*

§. 16. If we here make a further enquiry into the Schoolmen concerning the Adoration or Veneration due to the Symbols, they state the same toward them as toward Images, the sacred Utensils, the H. name of *Jesus*, and other Holy things. *Omnes* (saith *Vasquez*, *in 3. Thom. tom. 1. disp. 108. c. 12.*) *eodem modo de speciebus Sacramenti, quo de Imaginibus, philosophari debent.* And then of Images we know the Definition of the *Second* Council of *Nice* referred to by *Trent* —— *non latria.* And for what they say of Images I refer you to the preceding Discourse on them, §. 42, *&c.* It is true, that some of the later Schoolmen (to defend the expressions of some of the former) have endeavoured to show how a latrical, qualified, secondary co-adoration may *improprie* or *per accidens* be said to be given to the symbols also, as sacramentally joyned with our Lord's Body, and as this body is as it were vested with them; such as, say they, when Christ was adored here on Earth, was given also to his Garments, *i.e.* without making in the act of worship a mental separation of his Person from his Cloths; as *Bellarmin* explains it, *de Euchar. l 4. c. 29.* ——*Neque enim* (saith he) *jubebant Christum vestibus nudari antequam adorarent*; *aut animo & cogitatione separabant a vestibus cum adorarent*; *sed simpliciter Christum, ut tunc se habebat, adorabant: tametsi ratio adorandi non erant vestes, imo nec ipsa Humanitas, sed sola Divinitas.* Or do allow the giving of the external sign of *Latria* to them: as Bowing to, Kissing, Embracing them; but this without any the least internal act of *latria*, or any other honour or submission directed to them, which such inanimate things are uncapable of; as *Vasquez* explains it; who is so prodigal of this external sign of honour, after he hath stript it of any internal *latria*, or other worship whatever that may accompany it; that he allows this external sign not only to all Holy things, but to any Creature whatever, (in our inward adoration mean-while only of God,) upon the general relation they have to him. But indeed such an abstraction of the external sign, from an internal honour or respect (as other Catholicks censure his opinion) makes these outward gestures, without any mental intention attending them as to such object, like those of a Puppet or Engine, utterly insignificant: and so *Vasquez*, instead of communicating the *latria* to Images,

to

to the Symbols, to other Holy things, ſeems, in the judgment of others, to allow them no honour or veneration at all; and ſo, in ſeeming to ſay too much, to ſay too little; which hath been more largely diſcourſed before, *Of Images* §. 42. *&c.* And a late Author * might have done well, in mentioning this Author's Opinion, to have given alſo a true relation of it, affirming only an external ſign of honour given to the creature void of any internal the leaſt reſpect to them; *Ita ut tota mentis intentio in Exemplar, non in Imaginem* [or, Deum, non Creaturam] *feratur:* which would eaſily have taken away all that malignity he faſtens upon it. This for *Vaſquez.* And as for *Bellarmin*'s adoration *improprie* and *per accidens*, Biſhop *Forbes* tells us *l.* 2. *c.* 2. §. 11. *Sententia iſta* Bellarmini *plurimis Doctoribus Romanenſibus diſplicet.* And *Bellarmin* himſelf, as appears by the former citations, waving theſe School diſputes, tells us, ——*Status Quæſtionis non eſt niſi*, An Chriſtus in Euchariſtia ſit adorandus? *i. e.* no more is defined, decided, impoſed on Chriſtians faith by the Church, than this: nor more needs be deſputed with, or maintained againſt, Proteſtants, than this. [This in the 2*d.* place from §. 11. Of Catholicks profeſſing their Adoration with divine worſhip of Chriſt, only preſent in the Sacrament with the Symbols, not of the Symbols; or, not, of the Sacrament, if taken for the Symbols.]

* *Stillingfleet Rom. Idol. p.* 129.

3*ly.* Therefore alſo Catholicks *ground their Adoration* (a thing Cardinal *Perron* much inſiſts upon in his Reply to King *James*) *not on Tranſubſtantiation*, (tho' both Tranſubſtantiation and Conſubſtantiation involve it; ſo that, either of theſe maintained, Adoration neceſſarily follows) as if, Tranſubſtantiation defeated, Adoration is ſo too; *but on a Real Preſence* with the Symbols; which in general is agreed on by the *Lutheran* together with them. Which Adoration they affirm due, with all the ſame circumſtances wherewith it is now performed, tho' Chriſt's Body were preſent with the Symbols, neither as under the accidents of Bread, as they ſay; nor under the ſubſtance of Bread, as the *Lutheran* ſaith; but, tho' after ſome other unknown manner, diſtinct from both: and if they were convinced of the error of Tranſubſtantiation, and of the truth of the preſence of the ſubſtance of the Bread unchanged; yet as long as not confuted in the point of *Real Preſence*, they would never the leſs for this continue to adore the ſelf ſame Object, as now, in the ſelf ſame place, namely, the Body of Chriſt ſtill preſent there with the Symbols, and therefore there adorable; tho' preſent after another manner than they imagined. See the argument of *Barnefius* a *Roman* Writer *apud Forbeſ.* l. 2. c. 2. §. 12. §. 17.

Corpus.

Corpus Christi est cum pane vel permanente, vel transeunte, uno vel alio modo, & per consequens non est idololatria adorare Christum ibi in Eucharistia realiter præsentem. See in *Conc. Trid.* 13. §. *c.* 5. the reason immediately following the requiring of Adoration, ——*Nam illum eundem Deum præsentem in eo* [i. e. Sacramento] *adesse credimus, quem Pater introducens in orbem terrarum dicit,* Et adorent eum, *&c.*

If therefore the *Roman* Church enjoyns these three: 1. To believe *Christ's Corporal presence* in the Sacrament. 2. To believe such presence *by way of Transubstantiation.* 3. To *adore Christ* as being there present: It follows not that she enjoyns the third in order to the second: but may only, in order to the first; as the first being (without the second) a sufficient ground thereof. Neither can I, disbelieving the second, yet believing the first, refuse obedience to the third, that is, to worship the same object in the same place, as those do who also believe the second; and in my believing both the first and the second, yet may I nevertheless ground the third only on that, which is by Christians more generally agreed on; and still worship out of no other intention, after Transubstantiation believed, than I did before I believed it (when only I held in general a corporal presence) or than others do; who, believing a Real presence, do not yet believe Transubstantiation.

§. 18. 4. Let us, then, not granting it, suppose Transubstantiation an error; yet if the tenent of Corporal or Real presence (as held by the *Lutherans*, or others) be true, *Catholicks* plead, *their Adoration is no way frustrated, but still warrantable,* and to be continued.

§. 19. 5*ly.* Suppose not only Transubstantiation, but Real presence an error, and the *Lutheran* and the *Roman* Catholick both mistaken; yet there can be *no pretence why these later,* in such Adoration, (grounded by both on Real presence with the Symbols) *will not be as excusable from Idolatry as the other.* For, thus far these two Parties agree: 1. That *Christ is corporally present:* 2. That *he may be worshipped:* 3. That *no other there but He may be worshipped;* not Bread, nor any other meer creature: 4. That *nothing visible in the Sacrament is He, or his Body;* which is present only invisibly, without any thing visible, inhering, or appertaining to it, as the subject thereof. They differ only about the manner of the presence of this invisible Substance. The one saith, it is there together with the Bread; the other saith there, instead of the Bread, and the Bread away; a thing also to God possible, for any thing we know. The one saith, he is there both under the substance and accidents

of

of Bread; the other, there under the accidents only of the bread. Now, whilst both worship the same Object in the same place, and veiled with the same sensible accidents, if the one adoring him as being under the substance of bread, (he not being there) are freed from any Idolatry in such worship; the other adoring him as being under the accidents of bread, (he not being there) cannot be made hereby Idolaters: since they say, and freely profess, that, if his body be not there, under those appearances, but the same substance still under them which was formerly; then they confess it a creature, and renounce all adoration of it.

Whereas therefore it is objected, That the substance of bread only being in that place, where they suppose Christ's Body, and not any Bread, to be, therefore in worshipping the thing in that place, they worship bread; this were a right charge, if they affirmed, that they worshipped the substance that is in that place under such accidents *whatever* it be: but this none say; but, that they worship it only upon supposition that it is Christ's Body, and not bread, and that for this supposition they have a rational ground, (of which by and by.) Now, saying they worship it, because it is so, is saying, if it be not so, they intend no worship to it. He that saith, I give divine Adoration to that which is under the *species* of Bread, because believed by me, or, if you will, certainly known by me (but he, indeed, mistaking) to be Christ's Body, and so Christ present, is yet far from saying, I worship whatever is under the *species* of Bread, whether it be Christ's Body or no. And he that saith the later of these, if bread happen to be there, is willingly granted an ἀρτολατρία; but not so the former.

Daille, as it much concerns him, excuseth a *Lutheran* adoring upon a falsly supposed real or corporal presence of our Lord, from any Idolatry, for this reason: Because, saith he, * *such adoration is mistaken not in this, ——that it addresseth it self to an Object not adorable, but only that by error it seeks and thinks to enjoy it in a place where it is not, and so he saith it becomes only* vain and unprofitable, *&c.* as is said before §. 8. The same therefore must he allow to *Catholicks*, if meaning nothing more by their Language of *Adoratio Sacramenti* than *Christi in Sacramento*; as hath been shewed before §. 12. *&c.* that they do not: and that the contention about this is a meer *Logomachy*; and that they also, as the others, ground their Adoration not on Transubstantiation, but Corporal Presence.

* 1. *Reply to Chamont*, p. 63.

As for *Costerus*, or perhaps some other *Roman* Writers, that say, if Transubstantiation [*where also they must mean*, or a Corporal Presence, §. 20.

ſence, *ſome other way*] were not true, the Idolatry of Heathens is much more excuſable, than of Chriſtians, that worſhip a bit of bread: they do not, or at leaſt are not neceſſitated to grant the conſequence neceſſary, that, if Tranſubſtantiation or Corporal Preſence fail, then they muſt adore the bread; which bread mean while they deny alſo to be there: no more than *Proteſtants* do or think themſelves neceſſitated to grant this conſequence, That if Conſubſtantiation or Corporal Preſence fail, then the *Lutherans* do adore the Bread; which bread alſo tho' the *Lutherans* affirm to be there, yet do other Proteſtants deny that the *Lutherans* worſhip. But *Coſterus*, and others, only maintain this: That, ſuppoſing that which is impoſed upon them, *viz.* that *Catholicks*, if there be no Tranſubſtantiation, do worſhip a bit of bread; the Heathen Idolatry, in their worſhipping a golden or ſilver Image, or ſome living creature, *&c.* would be far more tolerable, and more noble. Shewing by this (as Dr. *Taylor* expreſſeth it, *Liberty of Propheſying*, p. 258.) *That they are ſo far from worſhipping the bread in ſuch caſe, that themſelves profeſs it to be Idolatry to do ſo; and intending, by advancing this fault the higher, the more to make appear the impoſſibility of ſuch an error, its for ſo many hundred years poſſeſſing the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, aſſiſted by our Saviour to the end of the World, and the Pillar of Truth: and thinking the greatneſs of this crime a good argument of the Churches innocency therein; whilſt perhaps, in ſome ſmaller matters, ſhe might be liable to a miſtake. I do believe* (ſaith Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epilog.* 3. l. 30. c. p. 353.) *that it hath been ſaid by great Doctors of the Church of* Rome, *that they muſt needs think themſelves flat Idolaters, if they could think that the Elements are not aboliſhed: That ſhews with what confidence they would have the World apprehend, that they hold their opinion; but not, that the conſequence is true; unleſs that which I have ſaid be reprovable.* And again, in *Juſt weights* c. 19. ——*When they ſay they muſt be flat Idolaters, if the Elements be there, zeal to their opinion makes them ſay more than they ſhould ſay.* —— Laſtly, *If Coſterus* ſaith, that Tranſubſtantiation failing, Catholicks do worſhip the bread, *Bellarmin de Eucha.* l. 4. c. 30. and others, ſay juſt the contrary, arguing thus concerning a Catholick's worſhipping an unconſecrated Hoſt, which is nothing but bread, ——*Adoratio ex intentione* [i. e. ſuch as is rationally grounded] *potiſſimum pendet. Quare qui* [talem] *panem adorat, quod certo credat non eſſe panem ſed Chriſtum, is proprie & formaliter Chriſtum adorat, non panem.* Which may as well be ſaid of an Hoſt conſecrated, that is not Tranſubſtantiated (when the adorer upon probable grounds believes

believes it to be ſo,) but remains ſtill bread, ——*Qui hunc panem adorat, quod certo credat non eſſe panem, ſed Chriſtum, is proprie & formaliter Chriſtum adorat, non panem.* And the ſame, much-what, as by *Bellarmin*, is ſaid by Dr. *Hammond*, *Diſc. of Idolatry*, §. 64. *That, ſuppoſing their error be grounded on an honeſt and blameleſs miſunderſtanding of Scripture, it is, tho' material, yet perhaps in them not formal Idolatry; becauſe, if they were not verily perſwaded that it were God, they profeſs they would never think of worſhipping it.* Thus he.

This in the 5*th.* place of not only Tranſubſtantiation, but Real Preſence being ſuppoſed an error, yet that the *Roman* practice, or error, compared with the *Lutheran*, the firſt is no more peccant than the later; and therefore that the *Lutheran* by *Proteſtants* being excuſed from Idolatry, ſo ought the *Roman Catholick* too.

6. Both theſe being ſuppoſed errors, and indeed no Preſence of §. 21. Chriſt's Body with the Symbols at all, as is by them both imagined there; yet, *ſuch Adoration*, by the one or the other, of *Chriſt*, who is a true object of ſupreme Adoration, and only by them miſtaken to be in ſome place where he is not, *cannot be termed any ſuch Idolatry, as is the worſhipping of an object not at all adorable.* So, for example, If we ſuppoſe a Heathen worſhipping a Heathen-God, as having ſome particular reſidence in an Image; or an *Iſraelite* worſhipping the true God of *Iſrael*, as having a ſpecial reſidence in the Calf at *Sinai*; or in *Jeroboam*'s Calves, called alſo by him *Cherubims*; or laſtly, a *Manichean*, miſtaking nothing in the Nature or Attributes of our Lord Chriſt, ſave that he thinks him to have ſome particular reſidence in the Sun, and ſo worſhipping him as preſent there: None of theſe would be any ſuch Idolatry, or parallel to it, as that of another Heathen worſhipping the very Molten Image; or *Iſraelite* worſhipping the very Calf for his God; or *Manichean* worſhipping the Sun it ſelf for Chriſt. Again; neither can any of theſe that adore only God or Chriſt as ſpecially preſent where indeed he is not, (*e. g.* as fancied God ſo preſent in the Calf, or Chriſt in the Sun,) if we ſuppoſe ſomething elſe inviſibly and undiſcerned by him to be there preſent, as if we imagine an Angel in the Sun, or a Serpent within the Calf, therefore be ſaid to adore ſuch Angel, or Serpent: and whatever fault may be in ſuch worſhip, yet it would be great injuſtice to accuſe ſuch *Iſraelite* or *Manichean*, of adoring ſuch Angel or Serpent upon this indefinite Propoſition, that *he profeſſeth to worſhip that which he believes to be preſent there*; eſpecially if ſuch perſon do alſo declare againſt the adoration of any ſuch particular things, if, contrary to his be-

lief, there preſent. Neither then can it be juſtly deduced from a *Lutheran*'s or *Catholick*'s adoring Chriſt as under the ſubſtance or *ſpecies* of Bread, that therefore theſe adore the thing it ſelf that is preſent under them.

§. 22. 7. Whatever fault or alſo Idolatry it may be called (tho' not ſo groſs as the former) in a *Manichean* that worſhips Chriſt in the Sun, or in an *Iſraelite* that worſhips God as ſpecially preſent or reſident in the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* or that at *Sinai*, becauſe it is adoring a fancy of their own, without any rational ground or pretence thereof; and however meerly a good intention grounded upon a culpable ignorance can excuſe none from Idolatry, or any other fault, (which as it is often preſſed by *Proteſtants*, is freely granted by *Catholicks.*) Yet ſince *Daille* (and, I ſuppoſe, other Proteſtants with him) doth allow, not an abſolutely certain, but a reaſonable, tho' miſtaken ground or motive of Adoration, ſufficient for avoiding the juſt imputation of Idolatry, [upon which account a Diſciple adoring with divine worſhip a perſon very much reſembling our Saviour, when he was upon Earth; or, ſuppoſing a conſecrated Hoſt truly adorable, one, who adores an Hoſt placed on the Altar, and by ſome deficiency in the Prieſt, not truly conſecrated, is freely abſolved by them herein from committing any Idolatry. See before §. 8.] Hence therefore if *Catholicks can produce a rational ground of their apprehending Chriſt preſent in the Euchariſt*, tho' poſſibly miſtaken in it, *they are to be excuſed from Idolatry*, upon the ſame terms.

§. 23. (1.) Now here firſt; the *Lutherans* being allowed to have ſuch a plauſible ground or motive for their Adoration, whereby they become by other *Proteſtants* abſolved from Idolatry in adoring our Lord as preſent there, (only their Adoration *inutile* (ſaith *Daille*) *& tombent en neant*,) I ſee not why the ground of *Roman Catholicks* ſhould be any whit leſs valued than theirs. For, if we compare the one's Con-- with the other's Trans--ſubſtantiation, the later ſeems more agreeable to our Lord's words, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*; and to the moſt plain literal obvious ſenſe thereof, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, by a change of the Bread, rather than, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, by a conjunction with the Bread; and therefore is the *Roman* equalled with, or elſe preferred before, the *Lutheran* ſenſe by many Proteſtants, that are neutral and diſſent from both. [*Longius Conſubſtantiatorum* (ſaith Biſhop *Forbes*, *de Euchar. l.* 1. *c.* 4 §. 5.) *quam Tranſubſtantiatorum ſententiam a Chriſti verbis recedere, ſive litera ſpectetur, ſive ſenſus, affirmat R.* Hoſpinianus *& cæteri* Calviniani *communiter.* And *Hoſpinian. Hiſtor. Sacram. 2. part. fol. 6.* ſaith

of

of *Luther*, ——*Errorem errore commutavit, nec videns ſuam opinionem non habere plus, imo etiam minus coloris, quam Scholaſticorum & Papæ.* And ſee the ſame judgment of the *Helvetian* Miniſters, and *Calvin*, *apud Hoſpinian. f.* 212.] But next; *Catholicks* founding their Adoration not on Tranſubſtantiation, but on Corporal Preſence, the ſame common ground of this they have with *Lutherans*, viz. *our Lord's words implying*; and ſo it muſt excuſe both, or neither.

(2.) Laying aſide this compariſon, let us view more particularly what *rational ground* Catholicks exhibit of this their belief of a Corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt, and ſo of Adoration. §. 24.

I. This their Ground then of ſuch a Corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt (after a poſſibility thereof, granted alſo by ſober Proteſtants *) is pretended to be *Divine Revelation*, and if it be ſo as pretended, then no argument from our ſenſes, and againſt it, valid:) and that (as was ſaid but now) taken in its moſt plain, literal, natural, and grammatical ſenſe, in the words, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*; ſo often iterated in the Goſpel, and again by S. *Paul*, without any variation or change, or explication of that which yet is pretended by *Calviniſts* to be a metaphorical expreſſion; and ſuch, if we will believe them, as this, that the *Church is his Body*, Eph. 1.23. or, *He the true Vine*, Joh. 15.1. A great argument this, (the Apoſtles punctual retaining ſtill, in their expreſſing the Inſtitution thereof, the ſame language and words) that our Lord intended it literally, as he ſpoke it. Pretended alſo to be Divine Revelation from many other Scriptures, (the citing and preſſing of which takes up all *Bellarmin*'s firſt Book *de Euchariſtia*, to which I refer the inquiſitive Reader:) but eſpecially from the Diſcourſe *Jo. 6.* Which Apoſtle writing his Goſpel ſo late, when the Communion of our Lord's Body and Blood was ſo much frequented and celebrated in the Church, ſeems therefore to have omitted the mention of it at all in his ſtory of the Paſſion, and the time of its firſt Inſtitution: becauſe he had dilated ſo much upon it before in relating a Sermon of our Lord's made in *Gallilee* about the time of the yearly Feaſt of eating the Paſchal Lamb, *Jo. 6. 4, &c.* ——*The literal and grammatical ſenſe of which Divine Revelation* (ſaith Dr. *Taylor*, *Liberty of Propheſying*, §. 20. *p.* 258.) *if that ſenſe were intended, would warrant* Catholicks *to do violence to all the Sciences in the circle. And that Tranſubſtantiation is openly and violently againſt natural Reaſon, would be no argument to make them disbelieve, who believe the myſtery of the Trinity in all thoſe niceties of explication which are in the Schools; (and which now adays paſs for the Doctrine of the*

* *See Guide in Controverſy, Diſc. 1. §. 62.*

the Church,) [or he might have said, which are in the *Athanasian* Creed,] *with as much violence to the principles of natural and supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagined to be in the point of Transubstantiation.* And elsewhere *(Real Presence*, p. 240.*)* saith, as who will not say? ——*That if it appear, that God hath affirmed Transubstantiation, he for his part will burn all his Arguments against it, and make publick Amends.*

§. 25. II. Again; *Catholicks* have for their *Rational ground* of following this sense, in opposition to any other given by Sectaries, the *Declaration* of it by the most Supreme and Universal *Church-Authority* that hath been assembled in former times for the decision of this controversie long before the birth of *Protestantism*; a brief account of which Councils, to the number of seven or eight (if the 2d. *Nicene* [*Act. 6. tom. 3.*] be reckoned with the rest) before that of *Trent*, all agreeing in the same sentence, see concerning the *Guide in Controversy, Disc.* 1. §. 57, *&c.* [Out of the number of which Councils said to establish such a Doctrine, as Bishop *Cosins, Hist. Transub.* c. 7. p. 149. after many others, hath much laboured to subduct the great *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* 3. upon pretence of the reputed Canons thereof their being *proposed* therein *only by the Pope*, but *not passed* or confirmed *by the Council*; so another late *Protestant* Writer upon another Protestant interest, *viz.* out of the 3d. Canon of the same Council, *charging* not only the *Pope* but the *Councils* themselves, and the *Catholick* Religion, as *invading the Rights of Princes*, hath with much diligence very well vindicated these Canons against the others, as the true Acts of this Great Assembly, and not only the designs of the Pope; and copiously shewed them (as in truth they were) owned as such, both in the same, and the following times. And thus the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in this Council is firmly established, whilst *Catholicks* contend, in the other Canon concerning *Secular Powers*, the Sense of the Council is by *Protestants* mistaken.

Mr. Dodwel *Considerations of present concerument.* § 31. p. 165.

Now upon this, I ask what more *reasonable* or *secure* course in matters of Religion, *(*whether as to *Faith* or *Practice)* can a private and truly humble Christian take, than, where the sense of a Divine Revelation is disputed, to submit to that interpretation thereof, which the Supremest Authority in the Church, that hath been heretofore convened about such matters, hath so often and always in the same manner decided to him; and so to act according to its Injunctions?

§. 26. III. But, if these Councils be declined as not being so ancient as some may expect; *i. e.* not held before some controversy hapned

in

in the Church touching the point they decided, *Catholicks* ſtill have another very *Rational ground* of ſuch a ſenſe of the Divine Writ, *viz. the evident teſtimony of the more Primitive times.* Which that they have conveyed the Tradition of ſuch a ſenſe to the preſent Church, and to theſe former Councils, (to repeat what hath been ſaid already in *Conſiderations* on the Council of *Trent*, §. 321. *n.* 1. becauſe perhaps by ſcarcity of copies that Book may come to few hands) I think will be clear to any one, not much intereſſed, that ſhall at his leiſure ſpend a few hours in a publick Library to read, entire, and not by quoted parcels, the diſcourſes on this Subject; Of St. *Ambroſ. de Myſter. init. cap.* 9. --- the Author *de Sacramentis*, aſcribed to the ſame Father, 4. *l.* 4, and 5. Chapters. ---*Cyril. Hieroſol. Catecheſ. Myſtagog.* 4, *&* 5. ---*Chryſoſt in Matt. Hom.* 83. ---*In Act. Hom.* 21. ---*In* 1 *Cor. Hom.* 24. ---*Greg. Niſſen. Orat. Catechet. ch.* 36, 37. ---*Euſeb. Emiſſen.* or *Cæſarius Arelatenſis de Paſchate, Serm.* 5. ---*Hilarius Pictav. de Trinitate*, the former part of the 8*th.* Book. ---*Cyril. Alexand. in Evangel. Joan. l.* 10. *c.* 13. Concerning the authenticalneſs of which pieces enough alſo hath been ſaid elſewhere.

IV. In a conſequence of, and ſucceſſion from, this doctrine of §. 27.
thoſe Primitive times, and of the late[r] Councils of the Church, when this Point was brought into ſome Diſpute and Controverſie, a Catholick hath for a *Rational ground* of his Faith, and practice, *the univerſal doctrine and practice of the later* both Eaſtern and Weſtern *Churches* till *Luther*'s time, and at the *preſent* alſo, excepting his followers. For the Eaſtern Churches (diſputed by ſome Proteſtants) both their belief of a *corporal preſence* with the Symbols, and practice of *Adoration*, ſee what hath been ſaid at large in the *Guide in Controverſy, diſc.* 3. *c.* 8. (where alſo are exhibited the teſtimonies of many learned Proteſtants freely conceding it) and again, in *Conſiderations* on the Council of *Trent*, §. 321. *n.* 22. *p.* 313. and *n.* 9. *p.* 294. See alſo the late eminent evidences of the Faith and Practice of theſe Eaſtern Churches at this day, collected by Monſieur *Arnaud*, in his two replies to *Claude*; a brief account whereof alſo is given in the *Guide, Diſc.* 3. §. 81. *n.* 2, *&c.* In which matter (whereas one of the chiefeſt and commoneſt Pleas of Proteſtants is the Greek and Eaſtern Churches their according with them, whereby they ſeem to out-number the Roman) if any will but take the courage, notwithſtanding his ſecular Intereſt, candidly to examin it, I doubt not he will receive a full Satisfaction.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, ſee D. *Blondel* (one much eſteemed by Proteſtants, for his knowledge in ancient Church-Hiſtory) granting an alteration in the Doctrine concerning our Lord's Preſence in the Euchariſt (an Alteration he means from that which is now maintained by Proteſtants, and was by the former Antiquity) begun in the *Greek* Church after *A. D.* 754. * *i. e.* begun ſo ſoon as any diſpute hapned in the Eaſtern Church concerning this *Preſence*; which diſpute was firſt occaſion'd there upon an Argument which was taken from the Euchariſt, and urged againſt Images by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, under *Conſtantius Copronymus*, and was contradicted by *Damaſcen*, and ſhortly by the 2*d. Nicene* Council. In which opinion of the 2*d. Nicene* Council and *Damaſcen*, *Blondel* freely acknowledgeth the Greek Churches to have continued to this day. See *c.* 16. *p.* 399. Again, granting an Alteration in the ſame Doctrine (as is ſaid before) begun in the Weſtern Church *A. D.* 818.* *i. e.* as ſoon as the like diſpute hapned about this Point in the Weſtern Parts: which diſpute there was occaſioned by the Council held at *Frankfort* under *Charles the Great*, oppoſing the expreſſions of the foreſaid *Conſtantinopolitan* Council in like manner as the 2*d. Nicene* Council had done before. Laſtly, if we ask him, what this Alteration in the Eaſt firſt, and afterward in the Weſt, was; 1. He maketh it much-what the ſame in both. And then he explains it to be a kind of Impanation, or Conſubſtantiation, or Aſſumption of the Bread by our Lord Chriſt. His words, *c.* 19. are theſe *Des l' An.* 818. &c. ——*Some among the* Latins *did* (*as it were in imitation of the* Greek) *conceive a kind of Conſubſtantiation, partly like, partly unlike, to what many* Germains [he means Lutherans] *now maintain*; *which, to ſpeak properly, ought to be called* Impanation, *or Aſſumption of the Bread by the* Word *of* God. And c. 20. he goes on, ----*The opinion of* Paſchaſius, [whom he makes Leader in the Weſtern, as *Damaſcen* in the Greek Church] *had advanced before* A. D. 900. *an Impanation of the* Word, *fortified and getting credit by degrees*; *the eſtabliſhment of which* (ſaith he p. 440.) *both* Damaſcen *and* Paſchaſius *deſigned*. Wherein (he ſaith *p.* 441.) they ſuppoſed a kind of Identity between the Sacrament and the Natural Body of Chriſt, founded upon the inhabitation of the Deity in them; which at laſt produced, he ſaith, the eſtabliſhment of Tranſubſtantiation, under Pope *Innocent* the Third.

* *Eſclairciſſements ſur L' Euchariſtie c.* 15.

* *See Ibid. c.* 18.

Here then 1. We ſee granted, both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, the ſame Tenent. 2. We may obſerve, that this Tenent of *Impanation* he impoſeth on them, when well examined, is found much

much more groſs and abſurd than that of *Tranſubſtantiation:* For which ſee what is ſaid in *Bellarmin, de Euchar. l.* 3. *c.* 13. & 15. Or in *Suarez, de Sacrament. Diſp.*49. But 3. ſee in *Conſiderations on the Council of Trent* §. 321. *n.* 13. and *n.* 16. *&c.* that this Doctrine of *Damaſcen* and the *Greek* Church, and afterwards of *Paſchaſius* and the *Latin*, before *Innocent* the *Third*'s time, was plain Tranſubſtantiation; and is miſrepreſented by *Blondel* for Impanation; and therefore never hath the *Greek* Church hitherto had any conteſt or claſhing with the *Roman* concerning this point. And ſee the conceſſions alſo of other Proteſtants very frequent and more candid, of Tranſubſtantiation held by the *Greek* Churches of later times, as well as by the *Roman*, produced in the *Rational Account concerning the Guide in Controverſies*, Diſc. 3. c. 8. 4*ly*. Laſtly, theſe Churches, in which, he ſaith, ſuch an Alteration was made from the former Doctrine of Antiquity, deny it at all ſo to be; and affirm, that, when ſome new opinions appeared, they maintained and vindicated it as the Doctrine of the Fathers; their Proofs of it being alſo extracted out of the Fathers Teſtimonies. Now then to ſtand againſt ſuch a ſtrong ſtream of both Eaſt and Weſt running conſtantly in this courſe, ſeems to Catholicks, with S. *Auſtin* very unreaſonable. —— *Similiter etiam* (ſaith he, Epiſt. 118. Januario) *ſiquid horum tota per orbem frequentat Eccleſia: nam & hinc, quin ita faciendum ſit, diſputare, inſolentiſſimæ inſaniæ eſt.* And, ——*Græci omnes* (ſaith Biſhop *Forbes, de Euchar.* l. 2. c. 2.) [as well as the *Roman* Church] *adorant Chriſtum in Euchariſtia: Et quis auſit omnes hos Chriſtianos Idololatriæ arceſſere & damnare?*

V. Laſtly; beſides this great Body, Catholicks have ſince *Luther*'s time, in the Reformation, no ſmall number of Proteſtants, I mean ſuch as are the genuine Sons of the Church of *England*, proceeding thus far, as to confeſs both a *Real* Preſence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt, and *Adoration* of it as preſent there; a real preſence of it to each worthy Receiver, tho' not to the Elements. And *Hooker*, if he miſtook not the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in his time, ſaith, *Eccleſ. Pol.* l. 5. §. 67. ——*Wherefore ſhould the world continue ſtill diſtracted, and rent with ſo many manifold Contentions, when there remaineth now no Controverſy, ſaving only about the ſubject where Chriſt is?* ----*Nor doth any thing reſt doubtful in this, but whether, when the Sacrament is adminiſtred, Chriſt be whole within Man only, or elſe his Body and Blood be alſo externally ſeated in the very conſecrated Elements themſelves.* So that, if *Hooker* and his party are in the right, Catholicks do not miſtake Chriſt's Body as preſent in a place where it is not; but §. 28.

only in thinking it in that preſent to one thing, the Elements, when it is ſo only to another, the Receiver of them. But then the ſame Catholicks have another half of the Reformation, *viz.* all the *Lutheran* Proteſtants, that affirm, with the *Roman* Church, Chriſt's Body preſent alſo to the Elements, or Symbols. And ſee Mr. *Thorndike* alſo, *Epilog. l.* 3. *c.* 3. much for this preſence of Chriſt's Body to be *in*, *with*, or *under* the Elements, immediately upon, and by the conſecration of them, (which conſecration alſo he placeth (*l.* 3. 4. *c. p.* 24.) in the bleſſing of the Elements before the breaking, *&c.* mentioned before §. 7.). Look back now upon all theſe Pleas of Catholicks, and ſee if they will not make up at leaſt a *reaſonable ground* or motive of their Adoration. A reaſonable ground; I ſay not here (what I might) ſufficient to ſecure their faith from all ſuſpicion of error, but (which ſerves my purpoſe) to ſecure them from Idolatry in their Adoration, tho' they ſhould be miſtaken; when as other perſons, becauſe proceeding on like reaſonable motives, are by Proteſtants, in their Adoration of a miſtaken Preſence, or Object, excuſed from it; (See before §. 8.) As, for example, the *Lutheran*; the Adorer of one much reſembling our Lord here on Earth; the Adorer of an unconſecrated Hoſt, or Wafer placed on the Altar, *&c.* eſpecially when Catholicks in crediting ſuch divine Revelation of Chriſt's Preſence, and ſo for their Adoration, receive no contradiction (as it is pretended they do) from their ſenſes: becauſe they adore, I mean with divine Adoration, nothing viſible, or ſenſible at all, nor any ſubſtance inviſible wherein any thing that occurs to their ſenſes inheres; but only underſtand Chriſt's Body preſent there, where their ſenſes can no way certainly, and againſt any pretended divine Revelation, inform them, either when it is preſent, or not; ſince *ſalvis omnibus phænomenis*, all appearances granted moſt true, ſuch a Preſence is poſſible.

§. 29. Theſe rational Grounds of *Catholicks* for Adoration, which we expected ſhould have been moſt ſtrictly examined by thoſe who conclude the *Roman* practice herein Idolatry, are ſlightly paſſed over by *Daille*, in pronouncing that this error of Catholicks *vient toute entiere de leur paſſion*, Apolog. des Eglis Reform. c. 11. p. 90. And after in reducing all their ground thereof to a —— *la ſeule authorite du Pape & de ſon Concile*: and by Dr. *Taylor*, *Real Preſ.* §. 13. *p.* 346. in calling them ---- *ſome trifling pretences made out of ſome ſayings of the Fathers.* Elſewhere indeed, when he was in a more charitable temper (*Liberty of Propheſ. p.* 258.) he ſaith, *That for a motive to ſuch an opinion*, Roman Catholicks *have a divine Revelation, whoſe literal and grammatical Senſe, if that Senſe was in-*

intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences in the Circle: but prudently there omits their Plea of *Catholick Tradition*, ſecuring to them ſuch a literal ſenſe of the Text. Dr. *Stillingfleet* (*Rom. Idol.* c. 2. §. 7.) ſaith firſt, ——*That, if a miſtake in this caſe will excuſe the* Romaniſt, *it would excuſe the groſſeſt Idolatry in the World.* And in comparing two perſons, one worſhipping Chriſt as really preſent in the Sun, another, Chriſt as really preſent in the Sacrament, he ſaith, as inconſiderately as magiſterially, ——*That ſuppoſing a miſtake in both, we are not to enquire into the reaſons of the miſtake,* [i. e. as he ſaith before, concerning the probability of the one miſtake, more than of the other] *but the influence it hath upon our actions.* So he. But, what is more manifeſt, than that the influence which a miſtake hath upon our actions, as to making them culpable or innocent, is not always the ſame, but very various, and often contrary; rendring them ſometimes blameleſs, ſometimes faulty, according as the miſtake is ex- or in--excuſable? Next, he grants *Ibid.* §. 5. a *Catholick Tradition of Tranſubſtantiation* to be a ſufficient ground for Adoration: But the Catholick Tradition that is pleaded here neceſſary for Adoration, is only that of a *corporal* Preſence. Now, for a ſufficient evidence of ſuch a Tradition, I refer the conſciencious Reader to what hath been ſaid before, waving that of Tranſubſtantiation as to this Controverſy, tho' the ſame Catholick Tradition authorizeth both; namely, a corporal Preſence by a mutation of the Elements into our Lord's Body. This from §. 24. *Of the Rational grounds Catholicks have for their Adoration.*

8*ly.* For ſuch *Rational grounds* therefore of their worſhip as are here given (and *not* from any *exceſs of Charity*, or from the ſingular *Fancies* of ſome few, tho' learned men, as Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his Preface to *Roman Idolatry* would inſinuate) *Idolatry is by many Proteſtants* of late, either *not at all*, or but *faintly charged on the Church of* Rome. For firſt, ſee Mr. *Thorndike* in his *Epilogue*, 3. l. 30. c. p. 350. ——*I ſay firſt* (ſaith he) *that the Adoration of the Euchariſt, which the Church of* Rome *preſcribeth, is not neceſſarily Idolatry. I ſay not, what it may be accidentally by that intention which ſome men may conceal, and may make it Idolatry as to God: but I ſpeak upon ſuppoſition of that intention, which the profeſſion of the Church formeth.* And in his *Juſt Weights*, c. 19. p. 125. ---- *They who give the honour proper to God to his Creature, are Idolaters; they that worſhip the Hoſt give the honour due to God to his Creature: this is taken for a* Demonſtration, *that the worſhip of the Hoſt is Idolatry. But will any Papiſt acknowledge, that he honours the Elements of the Eucha-* §. 30.

riſt, or, as he thinks, the Accidents of them for God? Will common Reaſon charge him to honour that, which he believes not to be there? If they were there, they would not take them for God; and therefore they would not honour them for God: And that is it (not ſaying *that they ſhould be Idolaters if the Elements did remain) that muſt make them Idolaters.* And *Epilogue* p. 357. in general he ſaith; —— *Whoſo admits Idolatry,* [i. e. in any point whatever] *to be taught by the* Roman Church, *can by no means grant it to be a Church; the very being whereof ſuppoſeth the worſhip of one God, excluſive to any thing elſe.* The *Roman Church,* then, muſt either be freed from the imputation of commanding any thing that is Idolatry, (*i. e.* adoration of a creature for God): or we muſt affirm, there to be, and to have been, no true Church of Chriſt, never ſince ſuch command of that which they ſay is Idolatry went forth, (which no judicious Proteſtant, I think, hath or dare ſay of the *Roman Church,* ſince the beginning of the Adoration of the Euchariſt:) For what Church or Sect of Religion can be Apoſtate at all, if not a Church committing, and commanding Idolatry; even the worſhipping of a piece of Bread, which themſelves made, for that God which made them and Heaven and Earth.

And thus Biſhop *Forbes, de Euchar.* l. 2. c. 2. *Perperam* ἀρτολατρείαν Romanenſibus *a pleriſque Proteſtantibus objicitur, & illi Idololatriæ craſſiſſimæ & graviſſimæ ab his inſimulantur & damnantur; cum plerique* Romanenſes, *ut & alii fideles, credant panem conſecratum non eſſe amplius panem, ſed corpus Chriſti; unde illi non panem adorant: ſed tantum ex ſuppoſitione, licet falſa, non tamen hæretica, aut impia, vel cum fide directe pugnante, ut ſuperiore libro oſtenſum eſt, Chriſti corpus, quod vere adorandum eſt, adorant. In Euchariſtia enim mente diſcernendum eſſe Chriſtum a viſibili ſigno docent ipſi; & Chriſtum quidem adorandum eſſe, non tamen Sacramentum, quia ſpecies illæ ſunt res creatæ & inanimes, & conſequenter incapaces adorationis.* And *Ibid.* ſhewing the *Greek* and Eaſtern Church, as well as the *Roman,* to uſe it, he concludes, *Quis auſit omnes hos Chriſtianos Idololatriæ arceſſere & damnare?* After the ſame manner the Archbiſhop of *Spalato, de Repub. Eccleſ.* 7. l. 11. c. n. 6. —— *Reſpondeo* (ſaith he) *me nullum idololatricum crimen in adoratione Euchariſtiæ, ſi recte dirigatur intentio, agnoſcere. Qui enim docent, panem non eſſe amplius panem, ſed corpus Chriſti, illi profecto panem non adorant: ſed ſolum ex ſuppoſitione, licet falſa, Chriſti corpus vere adorabile adorant. Non enim noſtri dicunt ſpecies panis & vini, hoc eſt, accidentia illa eſſe adoranda.*

Biſhop *Bramhal*, cited before, §. 6. ——*The Sacrament is to be adored, ſaid the Council of* Trent. *The* Sacrament, i. e. *formally the Body and Blood of Chriſt ſay ſome of your Authors: we ſay the ſame.* ——*The* Sacrament, i. e. *the* ſpecies *of Bread and Wine ſay others: that we deny.* Thus he.

D. *Taylor*, in his *Liberty of Propheſying*, p. 258. confeſſeth the Subjects of the Church of *Rome* no Idolaters in this kind; at leaſt ſo as to worſhip Bread or any creature with Divine Worſhip, and as God: For, ——*It is evident*, ſaith he, *that the* Object *of their Adoration (that which is repreſented to them in their minds, their thoughts, and purpoſes, and by which God principally, if not ſolely, takes eſtimate of humane actions) in the Bleſſed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypoſtatically joyned with his holy Humanity; which Humanity they believe actually under the veil of the Sacramental ſigns. And if they thought Him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the Bread in this caſe, that themſelves profeſs it to be Idolatry to do ſo; which is a demonſtration that their ſoul hath nothing in it that is idololatrical,* [*i.e.* as to the directing this their divine worſhip to an undue object.]

Which things if ſaid right by him and the others, the ſame Dr. *Taylor* is faulty in his charge in *Real Preſence*, p. 334. Faulty I ſay, in charging on the Church of *Rome*, not their worſhip of a right Object in a ſome-way unlawful and prohibited manner, this we are not here examining; but their worſhip of an undue Object of Adoration, of a creature inſtead of God: for ſo he chargeth them there. *If* (ſaith he there) *they be deceived in their own ſtrict Article*, [he means of Tranſubſtantiation,] *then it is certain, they commit an act of Idolatry in giving divine honour to a mere creature, the image, the Sacrament and repreſentment of the Body of Chriſt.* Thus he. *When it is evident that the Object*, &c. *is the only true and eternal God*, &c. as he ſaid before in the place cited, and muſt ſay if he will ſay truth. So, faulty is alſo *Daille*, (*Reply to Chaumont*, p. 63.) in his charging the Church of *Rome* to worſhip Bread, upon this arguing: *Catholicks adore that ſubſtance that is veiled with the accidents of Bread and Wine; but this ſubſtance is Bread:* Ergo *they adore Bread.* By which arguing he may as well prove the *Lutherans* in the Euchariſt to adore a Worm or a Mite, thus: The *Lutherans* adore that ſubſtance which is joyned with the Bread; but that ſubſtance is a Worm or Mite: (for ſuch thing may be there with the Bread at ſuch time of Adoration) *Ergo*, they adore a Worm. Whereas both the *Catholick* and *Lutheran* explain the indefinite term [*that which,*] uſed in the *major* Propo-

§. 31.

sition, restrictively to the Body of Christ, and exclusively to any other substance whatever, that is, or may be, there, either with the Bread, or under its accidents. Faulty also is Dr. *Stillingfleet, Rom. Idol. c.* 2. in saying the Protestants controversie with Catholicks is; *Whether proper Divine Worship, in the time of receiving the Eucharist, may be given to the Elements on the account of a corporal Presence under them*, p. 117. And, as for the passage in the Council of *Trent, sess.* 13. *c.* 5. urged by him there for it, his mistake is shewed before, §. 12. And so, faulty, in his concluding, *p.* 118. ——*That the immediate term of that Divine Worship given by* Catholicks, *is the external and visible signs or elements.* And again, *p.* 124. *That, upon the principles of the* Roman *Church, no Man can be satisfied that he worships not a mere creature with divine honour, when he gives Adoration to the Host:* [whenas Catholicks expound themselves to mean by Host in their Adoration, not the Symbols, or *Sacramentum*, but *rem Sacramenti.*] Again, *p.* 125, 127, 129.——*That, supposing the Divine Nature present in any thing, gives no ground upon that account to give the same worship to the thing wherein it is present.*] [Catholicks grant this as much as he: and doth not himself say several times, *That* Catholicks *condemn the worshipping of a mere creature for Idolatry?*] See §. 4. p. 120.——*If* (saith he) *it should be but a mere creature* [that I adore,] *all the World cannot excuse me from Idolatry, and my own Church* [he means the *Roman*] *condemns me; all agreeing that this is gross Idolatry.* Again; *p.* 119. *It is* (saith he) *a principle indisputable among them,* [*i. e.* Catholicks,] *that to give proper divine honour to a creature is Idolatry.* Again; *p.* 126. he saith, ——*he finds it generally agreed by the Doctors of the* Roman *Church, that the Humane Nature of Christ considered alone,* [*i. e.* without an Hypostatical union to the Divinity,] *ought not to have divine honour given to it:* [and therefore neither any other creature whatever, that is not Hypostatically united, as none besides It is.] All these, I say, faulty and mistaken in charging the Church of *Rome* with this *species* of Idolatry, of worshipping a creature [*the Bread*] instead of Christ; from which the other Protestants clear it.

§. 32. Lastly, Dr. *Hammond*, in his Treatise of *Idolatry*, §. 64. upon supposition that the ignorance or error of *Catholicks* is grounded on misunderstanding of Scripture, [*I add, so expounded to them by the supreme Church-Authority,*] seems to charge them rather with a material than a formal Idolatry; which material Idolatry in many cases is or may be committed without sin; as also material Adultery, and the like. His words are; ——*That if it be demand-*

ed, Whether in this caſe, that their ignorance or error be grounded on miſunderſtanding of Scripture, this ſo ſimple and not groſs ignorance may ſerve for a ſufficient antidote to allay the poiſon of ſuch a ſin of material, tho' perhaps in them not formal, Idolatry, &c. *becauſe if they were not verily perſwaded that it were God, they profeſs they would never think of worſhipping it? ——he had no neceſſity to define and ſatisfie it, being only to conſider what Idolatry is; and not how excuſable ignorance or miſtake can make it.* And indeed Proteſtant Writers, that will have it to be Idolatry, are concerned to make it ſuch a gentle one, as that the practice thereof, died in, and it neither particularly confeſſed, nor repented of, yet excludes not from Salvation; or elſe they muſt damn all thoſe who lived in the viſible communion of the Church *Catholick* for five or ſix hundred years, by their own confeſſion.

9. Mean-while Catholicks willingly grant to Proteſtants that, §. 33. for which *Daille*'s Apology of the *Reformed Churches, c.2.p.98.* much contendeth in their behalf: That to Adore that which the Adorer believes not to be our Lord, but Bread; or to perform the external ſigns of Adoration to our Lord as preſent there, where the worſhipper believes he is not, is unlawful to be done by any, ſo long as the perſon continues ſo perſwaded: For, *Conſcientia erronea obligat.* But then, if we ſuppoſe the Church *juſtly* requiring ſuch Adoration upon ſuch a true Preſence of our Lord; neither will the ſame perſon be free from ſinning greatly in his following ſuch his conſcience, and in his not adoring: diſobedience to the Churches juſt commands being no light offence. Neither for the yielding ſuch obedience in general is it neceſſary that the Churches Subjects be abſolutely certain of the rightneſs or lawfulneſs of the Churches Decrees or Commands: For, thus, the more ignorant in ſpiritual matters and the things commanded that any perſon is, the more free and releaſed ſhould he be from all obedience; the contrary of which is true. But ſufficient it is even in the ſtating of judicious Proteſtant Divines, when writing againſt Puritans, (ſee *Conſiderations on the Council of* Trent, §. 295. *n.* 3, 4.) that ſuch perſons be not abſolutely certain that the Churches commands are unjuſt, aud that they do in ſomething demonſtratively contradict God's Law: which plain contradiction, if a private perſon can ſee it, 'tis ſtrange the Church ſhould not. And as to this particular matter, after the Churches motives of Adoration, that are delivered before, §. 24, &c. well conſidered, I leave the Reader to judge, whether ſuch a pretended certainty can have any ſolid ground. It is better indeed to forbear an action, when we are not certain of the

lawfulneſs thereof, provided that we are certain, that in ſuch forbearance we do not ſin. But thus certain of our not ſinning in ſuch forbearance we cannot be, concerning any thing that is enjoyned us by our lawful and Canonical Superiors; whom we are obliged to obey: unleſs (as hath been ſaid) we are firſt certain that ſuch their command is unlawful.

And hitherto of this Controverſie; where the Two main things that ſeem worthy to be examined, by any Chriſtian, who in this point ſeeks ſatisfaction, are, 1. Whether the *Roman* Catholick's *grounds* of believing Chriſt's *Corporal* Preſence in the Euchariſt, with the Symbols, *are ſolid and true.* 2. And next; Whether this Church, *for any ones enjoying her Communion, exacts more* of him, than the *confeſſing* that Chriſt as preſent there *is* alſo there to be *adored:* whilſt mean-while ſuch perſon renounceth and declares againſt any adoration, or, if you will, co-adoration of the *ſpecies*, or any other thing whatever there preſent, with any *Latria* or ſupreme worſhip, proper or improper, or with any other honour or reverence, ſave only ſuch an inferior veneration as is exhibited by us to other Holy Things.

FINIS.